The Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. XX December, 1944 No. 4

The Story of a Trading Boat, 1793*

The log-book forms but a colourless record of a ship's journey—if the journey happens to be without any exciting event. But in the 'good old day's a brave sailor was not wasted for lack of advenntures in the eastern waters. The freedom of the sea was yet unknown and the merchant nations of the west were free to fight each other without any let or hindrance once they were outside the lawful limits of the Christendom. The corsairs had a merry time and carried on their nefarious trade in defiance of God and man. The log books of the East India men therefore were neither dull nor dry and often furnished first rate materials for contemporary history and romance as well. Unfortunately the log books of Indian boats, if they were ever kept, have not come down to us. What thrilling tales they might have told us of unexpected encounters with the Malabar pirates, of the daring exploits of the Portuguese armada and the valiant deeds of the Angria brothers! Even in the last decade of the eighteenth century a coasting barque engaged in peaceful traffic had its moments of anxiety and apprehension, as we learn, not from a ship' log but from a captain's correspondence.

Andre Bartolomeu Da 'Cruz was the Captain and Supercargo of a small *ghurab*[1] in the service of His Majesty, the King of Cochin. His

* The paper is based on a series of twelve Portuguese letters preserved in the Cochin Records Office. An English translation of the entire series has been appended at the end of the article. I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the Government of Cochin for their permission to utilise this very interesting correspondence.

1 From Arabic 'ghorab' meaning 'galley'. The word was later corrupted into 'Grab'. In *Les Hindous*, vol. I (by Solvyn) it is described as a ship with three masts, a sharp prow and a bowsprit. The name 'is constantly mentioned in the sea—and river-fights of India from the arrival of the Portuguese down to near the end of the 18th century' (*Hobson-Jobson*, p. 391, Col. 2).

surname offers but an uncertain clue to his origin and ancestry for Christians of the Malabar readily assumed Portuguese names. His letters indeed were written in Portuguese but it formed in those days the *lingua franca* of the coast. In 1793 Da 'Cruz was sent on a commercial cruise to the ports of Ceylon and the east coast of India. His correspondence unfortunately is incomplete, some of his letters and all but one of the replies have been lost. The first of the series, as it now stands, opens dramatically with the announcement of the war that had broken out in Europe early that year (1st February 1793). It was written from Negapatam on the 2nd of June. At 4 in the evening that day Da'Cruz had cast his anchor in the harbour after a voyage of twelve days. On his way from Trincomali he had encountered inclement weather but ill winds caused him little concern and it was a news of worse import that weighed heavily on his mind. While off Puliadivo[2] on the Ceylon coast a salvo from a British fighting frigate bade him stop. The Captain enquired about his destination and the port of his origin and warned him that the English and the Dutch were at war with the French. Luckily he had not come across any French boat so far and the first thing he did on his arrival at Negapatam was to hurry to Nagore, four miles off, and see the English Resident for whom he had brought a letter of recommendation and to communicate to him the disquieting news. But neither Mr. Mitchel, the Resident, nor the rest of the local gentry on whom the Captain had occasion to call gave his report any credence. None the less he considered it his duty to acquaint his principal, the prime minister of Cochin, with what he had heard and a brief note was accordingly sent to him.

The next letter was dated the 5th of June. There was no longer any doubt about the war! The news had been confirmed from Madras[3] and the Resident had hurriedly left Negapatam with all his armed retinue. Da Cruz had not been invested with plenary power to take the measures

2 Evidently a slip for 'Moeletivoe' (Mullaittivo). a port on the east coast of Ceylon, nearly 50 miles to the north of Trincomali.

3 Da Cruz was told that war had been declared in Europe on the 14th March. The correct date is the 1st February 1793. The formal notice from the English Consul at Alexandria was brought to Madras by the Cruiser Drake on the 1st June. (George Baldwin to Margotty, Commander of the Drake at Alexandria 10 April 1793—Secret Cons., 11 June 1793, no. 4. Fort St. George Government to Governor-General in Council dated 1st June—Secret Cons., 11 June 1793, no. 1).

that the emergency demanded. He suggested that the Danish flag should be hoisted at once and a Captain of the same domicile should be appointed to disarm all suspicions about the nationality of the ship. A prompt decision was needed and he solicited an early reply. Meanwhile he would, he added, negotiate for a Danish passport that would secure for his boat and cargo a neutral status and the immunity it implied.

We next find Da Cruz at the Danish settlement of Tranquebar. It was only eighteen miles to the north of Negapatam and he spent the next ten weeks between these two ports. Mr. Mitchel himself had taken the precaution of furnishing his own boat with Danish pass and colours and the example of the English official had been emulated by the Captain of four French merchantmen. Da Cruz learnt that the Cochin flag would be of little avail if he met a French frigate on the high seas and prudence demanded that he should henceforth sail under a Danish flag and carry on his business in the name of a Danish subject. The employment of a Danish Captain as a security measure, was likely to prove expensive, as one gentleman had demanded a monthly salary of one hundred and fifty rupees. Events were moving fast. In a postscript to his third letter (Dated Tranquebar, the 10th June, 1793) Da Cruz added that "to-day the English gentlemen have taken Karikal."[4] This small French settlement was within a few miles of Negapatam and Nagore—and was not in a position to offer any effective defence.

By the 5th of the next month Da Cruz was once again at Negapatam. The Ghurab meanwhile had changed its name and nationality. It was henceforth Denmarca of Copenhagen, commanded by Jhan Pascal, a citizen of Tranquebar. He was engaged on a salary of forty rupees per mensem with free boarding and lodging besides an additional sum of forty rupees for his passage back. He was also permitted to dispose of twenty bags of merchandise in the port of disembarkation. Through the good offices of

4 The capture of Karikal is thus reported by William Michel, the Resident of Nagore and Negapatam in his letter dated Karikal 10 June, 1793 to the Fort St. George Govt." In consequence of the French having embarked with all their force and on information that a large quantity of grain belonging to individuals was intending to be conveyed from hence to Pondichery, I left Nagore in the night with fifty invalids and a small fieldpiece......and entered the town soon after Day light when Mons. Imbaud invited to give up the place at the first summons delivered over the Town and Districts to the Hon'ble Company (Pol. Cons., 29th June 1793. no. 16).

commodity and it would be foolish to transport sugar where it was not wanted. There was a demand for areca at Calcutta but the 'Chiquiny areca',[8] which apparently formed part of his cargo, was not liked in Bengal. He would therefore sell his areca at Madras, if possible, and carry it to Bengal only if he had no other alternative.

The military news is not without interest. A French frigate *La Gibele*,[9]—Captain Magan was at Tranquebar for a day only. It was well armed and had a fairly strong fighting force (Negroes are specially mentioned) on board. For twelve days La Gibele had been cruising along the short coast-line from Tranquebar to Negapatam, but she had no prospect of reaching Pondicherry "as that port is watched by the English fleet consisting of three Company's ships armed for fighting and Commodore Cornwallis's frigate." Da Cruz seems to have been accurately informed in this respect for it is substantially corroborated by the Governor-General who wrote to the Court on the 1st August 1793:[10] "The Government of Madas immediately commenced the necessary preparations for the siege of Pondicherry where Colonel Floyd with a large detachment arrived on the 11th July to blockade it on the landside, while the Commodore with His Majesty's frigate, the Minerva and three of your China ships 'Triton', 'Warley' and 'Royal Charlotte' are engaged to prevent supplies from being imported by sea, and the factories of Karikal, and Yanam have been taken possession of by the officers of the Madras Government.

Despite their undoubted superiority at the sea the British authorities were not inclined to hurt unnecessarily the susceptibilities of weak neutrals.

8 Is it the same as the variety known as *Chiki* in Bengal? See *A Dictionary of the Bengali Language* (by William Carey) where the word is explained as 'a harsh and disagreable kind of betelnut.

9 Probably a slip for *'La Sibylle'* (or *Sybile*) a French frigate with 40/44 guns (Pol. Letter to Court dated 1st August 1793). *La Sibylle* was at the offing from Tranquebar on the 13th July. She 'sent a boat ashore but did not anchor.' The next morning the vessel was sighted by Commodore Cornwallis off Pondicherry. On being chased by him she stood out to sea and made her next appearance at the offing from Karikal on the 1st July. Commodore Cornwallis cruised as far as Tranquebar in her quest, but she again succeeded in eluding him. (W. Cornwallis to Fort St. George Govt. dated 15 July and ditto to Kenworthy dated 19 July, Pol. Cons., 15 July 1793, no. 12 and 9th August 1793 no. 27).

10 Pol. Letter to Court dated 1st August 1793. Relevant extracts from the letter have been published in Ross's *Cornwallis Correspondence*, vol. 2 but there the names of the ships are misspelt.

Da Cruz writes "The boat of a French Captain that had taken Danish flag and passport in the name of Mr. Pingel who is now Captain was arrested at Madras but was released by letters that went from Tranquebar." Apparently the British in India were not disposed to treat the French menace in the Indian Ocean as really serious and the abuse of the Danish flag[11] was ignored with uncommon good humour.

On the 14th of August Tranquebar had a heavy rainfall. The main thoroughfares were under four feet of water. If the rain had continued for a few hours longer the settlement would have suffered considerable damage. Da Cruz left the Danish port soon afterwards and reported his arrival at Madras in a letter dated the 22nd August which however has been lost. Probably he did not touch at Negapatam and Tranquebar on his voyage home.

On the 13th September Da Cruz wrote from Madras that he was leaving for Bengal that very day. He had disposed of the areca he had without waiting for orders, for he was convinced that it would be more profitable to take 1,000 bags of rice instead of 300 *fardos*[12] (measures) of areca. The most interesting information that we find in this letter is about the exchange rate then current. In Bengal 330 Arcot[13] rupees would fetch 100 pagodas. Da Cruz therefore had credit for 21,546 Rs. from Messrs. Porcher Redhead of Madras at the rate of Rs. 350 per 100[14] pagodas.

11 Cf. "The Danes at Tranquebar are in the habit of granting passports for a certain premium to all French Ships." Resident at Cuddalore to Fort St. George Govt. dated 19 July 1793 (Pol. Cons., 9th August 1793, no. 26).

12 A cubic measure of dry and liquid things roughly equivalent to 6 gallons or 1,800 pounds (vide Sen—*Kanhoji Angria and other Papers*, p. 89. 93).

13 So-called because the rupee at Madras was originally that of the Nawab of Arcot. We have it on the authority of Prinsep that the Arcot rupees were at one time current in the districts of Chittagong and Dacca (*Useful Tables*, vol. I, p. 20 and also Beveridge: *Bakargunj*, p. 99).

14 It is interesting to note that this was the ratio officially fixed by the Proclamation of 7th January 1818 (Prinsep, *op. cit.*, p. 16).

15 Certainly not the silver coin of the same name issued by the Spanish and Portuguese Governments worth about 4s. 8d. Logan refers to a coin called 'gold patak' worth a ducat in his *Malabar* (i, p. 329). But equating 'Pattak' with the 'Pataca' of Da Cruz does not entirely solve our difficulty, because a ducat (9½ shillings) could hardly equal 10 pagodas (80 shillings in Madras) or 15⅞ dollars in value.

The exchange rate of Pataca[15] was 10 pagodas and 15⅞ dollars per pataca.

Busy as he was making arrangements for his voyage to Calcutta Da Cruz did not omit to impart the political news that might interest his correspondent. "The only news that I can give your Lordship is that Lord Cornwallis arrived at Madras on the 7th instant, also General Abercromby[16] has arrived from Bombay on the 1st of September. Mr. Pony arrived and Pondichery was captured on the 22nd ultimo and all the French prisoners have been brought to Madras but it is said that better order prevails at Pondichery now than previously." Here we find some slight inaccuracies about the dates—Cornwallis had indeed arrived at Madras on the 7th September and embarked for England on the 10th (on the Swallow Packet) October[17] but Pondichery capitulated on the 23rd and not on the 22nd August.[18] It may be safely presumed that "better order prevailed" at Pondichery after the British occupation, for Lord Cornwallis says that "the licentiousness and insubordination of the soldiers of the garrison had forced the Governor of Pondichery, after a fire of only a few hours from our first batteries...to surrender by capitulation."[19]

The first two letters that Da Cruz wrote from Calcutta are missing. That dated the 2nd November refers to the uncertainties of the market and the rumoured presence of the French frigates and corsairs on the east coast. Da Cruz was reliably informed that Lord Cornwallis had left for home on the 10th October and Sir John Shore,, his successor, took charge of the Government of Calcutta on the 26th. While the first date is quite accurate, the second anticipates the event by two days.[20] It is really sur-

16 Sir Robert Abercromby (1740-1827) Governor of Bombay and Commander-in-Chief there from 10 January 1790 to August 1793 when he proceeded to Madras on duty. Thence he joined the Supreme Council as Commander-in-Chief in India (28 Oct. 1793)—Buckland, *Dictionary of National Biography*. I.R.D., *Lists of Heads of Administration.*

17 Cornwallis to Court dated Fort St. George Sept. 18, 1793 (Ross, *Cornwallis Correspondence* II, p. 226).

18 The English occupation of Pondichery took place at 9 a.m. on the 23rd August (Pol. Cons., 9 Sept. 1793 no. 5) but hostilities had ceased and the French authorities had offered to capitulate on the 22nd August, though the capitulation was accepted by the English on the day following (Pol. Cons., 9 Sept. 1793, nos. 8. 9).

19 Cornwallis to Court (Ross, *op. cit.* II. 226).

20 Cornwallis to Hay, dated 10 Oct. 1793 (Pub. Cons., 28 Oct. 1793, no. 1).

prising that a person of Da Cruz's inquisitiveness should be wrongly informed about an event of such public importance, while he was actually at Calcutta.

Da Cruz was now confronted with an unexpected difficulty. The only cargo that he could lade at Calcutta was rice which he intended to sell at Gale or Colombo in Ceylon. That island it appears depended on imported rice even in the closing years of the eighteenth century. It was at that date a Dutch colony and the Dutch were the allies of the British. But the English would not permit even a neutral ship to touch at any port except their own and the export and sale of rice in foreign colonies were strictly interdicted. Da Cruz would of course be allowed to carry rice to Cochin but in that case the King, his master, would have to certify that cargo had actually been unladen at that port. Da Cruz was in a dilemma. He was prepared to give the undertaking demanded by the Calcutta government and, if the King so required, he would not later hesitate to break his pledge and visit the ports of Ceylon. But he wanted the written instructions of the King no doubt to safeguard himself against any subsequent charge of indiscretion. Meanwhile French boats were reported at Balasore and a siren warned all merchantmen about the risk of leaving the harbour (23rd November 1793). Da Cruz had previously decided to sail under an escort of six armed boats but his business was not finished as yet.

On the 28th November Da Cruz wrote to the prime minister that he had to execute a bond for forty-nine thousand rupees undertaking not to sell rice in ports other than that of Cochin and to furnish satisfactory evidence of his cargo being unloaded at that port. It took him another month to complete his purchases and the Ghurab left for Ceylon on the last day of the year. The King of Cochin, as we learn from his prime minister's letter (dated Cochin 31st December 1793), cared more for his profit than for the plighted word of his agent. Da Cruz was directed to sell all his rice in the ports of Ceylon contrary to the terms of the bond he had executed. He was expected to take every care that this breach of faith might go unnoticed. Whether he should bring cash or take a fresh cargo likely to find a sale at Cochin was left entirely to his discretion.

Robert Clerk to Hay, 10 Oct. 1793, *Ibid*, no. 2 and Public Progs., 28 Oct. 1793 p. 2085.

Thus concludes this interesting correspondence. When the voyage originally started and how it ended we do not know but one can very well imagine that Captain Da Cruz knew little peace since he came to hear of the European war and his anxiety continued unabated, till he reached the safety of the home waters; though the false colours under which he sailed afforded sufficient security against French aggression, every strange mast in the distant horizon must have caused a flutter in his guilty heart.

S. N. SEN.

DA CRUZ CORRESPONDENCE

1.

Most Excellent Sir,

I (beg to) inform you that to-day at 4 in the evening we cast anchor in this port after a voyage of 12 days. We had however bad weather after Trincomali, but by the grace of God we are at last quite well now. When we were off Puliadivo in the island of Ceylon, a small English fighting frigate of two masts, much bigger than our boat, followed behind. After firing a shot from a mortar and arriving at a short distance, the Captain enquired whether I had encountered French ships, where the Gurap came from and to whom it belonged. After being informed of everything he said that good care should be taken as the Dutch and the French were at war and might be coming this way. Immediately after landing I went to Nagore to see Mr. Michel Esq. (sic) the Resident (delivered the recommendation letter communicating all news) as well as other gentlemen. All of them say, there is no certainty, but nevertheless I deemed it well (to inform), because your Lordship may pick up more information in this respect and I may be directed in other particulars according to your Lordship's pleasure, in case I have to do something.

Hope that your Lordship in his benign kindness will communicate all this to His Majesty[21] with the respect of his servant.

A. B. Da Cruz

Negapatam, 2 June, 1793.

To

Most Excellency Senhor Govinda Menon,
Prime Minister of His Majesty, Cochin.

2.

Most Excellent Senhor,

The news of my arrival and other things may have been learnt by your Lordship from the letter of 2nd of the current month. However, as it happened on

21 Raja Rama Varma (1791-1805). He owned a number of coasting vessels commanded by European captains and carried on a brisk trade with all the ports from Bombay to Masalipatam. (*Cochin State Manual*, p. 133).

another occasion the news of the war of the English and the Dutch against the French and of the French against those (is confirmed) by a letter that has been received from Madras and Mr. Michel Esq., Resident left Nagore and Negapatam[22] on the night of the 4th with caution and all soldiers under arms. It is said that the news of the war has been published with the arrival of the Dreak[23] at Madras with packets brought from Bombay by way of [24] (?) and that the war was declared on the 14th March last, but I think it is the same ship Dreack that gave us information at Onor.[25] On account of the news current here I do not know what we should do. Your Lordship should direct me whether we should take Danish banner in support of which it will be necessary to take a (Danish) Captain (paying his salary and perquisites) and to take a passport in the name of a citizen of the same flag instead of the banner of our king. I expect all this will be quickly disposed of with directions about how I should act and work in this respect.

After communicating to His Majesty, Your Lordship should instruct this servant. Before receiving the reply I shall have to make efforts about the flag and passport for which prolonged negotiation will be necessary.

The devoted servant etc.
A. B. Da Cruz
Negapatam, 5 June, 1793
quarter night.

P.S.—Send letters in Portuguese in case the precaution of changing the flag and taking a captain should be necessary.

3.

Most Excellent Sir,

Your lordship will have ere now learnt the news of the war already written in two letters. Four French boats and the boat of Mr. Michel Esq., Resident of Nagore, took Danish pass and flag, the sale being made in the name of inhabitants of this colony paying 6 per cent on the value of the ship besides taking pass and a captain of the same nationality (lit. flag). I am labouring in this colony with that view for there is no other recourse. I believe that there will be no ill opinion

22 The corresponding text in the original makes no sense. A literal translation of the passage would be "a letter that has been received (Mr. Michel Esq., Resident) from Madras and left Nagore etc."

23 Read 'Drake.' The Drake Cruiser left Bombay sometime in March and reached Suez on 5th of April. It was here that she received the news of European War transmitted by the English Consul at Alexandria. She reached Madras on 1st June and Calcutta on the 11th. (Secret Cons., 11 June 1793, no. 2 and 4).

24 Should probably read 'by way of Suez.'

25 Also called 'Honavar'—historic town and port in the North Canara district in Bombay. The meeting between the Gurab and the Cruiser alluded to evidently took place when the latter was on her way to Suez from Bombay (i.e. sometime in March).

about me for doing (this) without order, but it may be supposed that if time does not permit (securing previous order) one is obliged to do all (that one can) for the master's good. Therefore, I expect that you will send a letter in Portuguese granting me permission and power to show that I have authority to sell and dispose of things as may be necessary and it is because I am in this predicament that I need the paper of instruction which I may present to Mr. Michel Esq., Resident of Nagore and other gentlemen to find out whether the flag of the King will serve and to avoid incurring heavy expenses. They however are of opinion that it (the King of Cochin's flag) will not be of any use, and it will be safer to take the flag and passport of Denmark. Hope that after informing His Majesty Your Lordship will quickly despatch the reply. Meanwhile I am and shall remain.

Your Lordship's Obedient Servant
A. B. Da Cruz
Tranquebar 10th June 1793.

To-day the English gentlemen have taken Carecal, the Captain of the flag demands a salary of Rs. 150/- per month.

4.

(No. 8 of the bound volume)
Negapatam 5 July 1793

Most Excellent Senhor Govind Menon Esq.
in triplicate

Received the respected (letter) of your Lordship dated the 17th June on the 28th in reply to mine of the 2nd and 5th from which I understood what Your Lordship says there. About taking Danish colour and pass I exerted my utmost, making sale in the name of the 2nd of Tranquebar (council) Senhor Jacob Edward Colbiornson, in which matter Mr. Michel Esq., Resident of Nagore and Negapatam also helped. In duties was paid in all the sum of three hundered six pagodas and 2 fanams. We have raised the Danish flag on the Gurab and assumed on that account a Danish name for the Gurap-Denmarca/Copenhagen. We have taken a man of the same place of Tranquebar, Jhan Pascal by name for our flag captain on a salary of 40 rupees a month with free boarding and lodging and the right of (disposing of) twenty bags in the port, where he may disembark; for his passage and expenses an additional month's pay namely 40 Rs will be paid.

All this formality is to show that the sale is (not?) void. I shall take two papers of the same tenor which your Lordship will receive after this. It appears that this expense will devolve on the freighters also, for they would also propose that pass and another flag should be taken and they might not freight unless these were secured, but supposing this is not so, more cargo will be freighted. If freighting is not approved I shall be obliged to take areca as ballast which will serve against expense and loss, for the rate that now prevails seem well advanced. God be praised. The reply to the letter of the 10th June written from Tranquebar

has not yet been received. I do not know whether it has been misdirected. About taking a Danish passport Your Lordship replies in his letter—"as may appear fit." On reflection Your Lordship will realise that for ensuring the inclusion in the cargo what His Majesty may order it is necessary to inform him about things and their conditions (anew) and to secure a plenary order. It is required for the assurance of the firms who will find it necessary to present it for their benefit. I send a list of the goods sold and disposed of. Due to the war merchants in their freight do not want to buy goods and the price has fallen. From the list of price current at Madras it seems that goods are cheap there also. Shall make all possible effort to extract what I can and shall communicate to Your Lordship what follows on my route and other things after this. Hope that Your Lordship will receive this in great prosperity and health and after communicating to his royal majesty despatch orders to your servant.

I remain your most obedient and devoted servant,

A. B. Da Cruz.

P.S.—The news is that Carecal and another village Henom by name have been taken by the English, with a boat that came from Mauritius, some people add.

5 (No. 9 of the bound volume)

Most Excellent Sir,

Received Your Lordship's letter on the 7th instant from which I understood what Your Lordship ordered. However about business Your Lordship says in the letter that His Majesty has ordered that it will not be proper to sell everything at Negapatam as it will cause great loss and will not bring other goods in their stead as cargo for the Gurab. This causes me pain for Your Lordship would not let it be supposed that your servant would sell goods without having reliable information and news about the current price with a view to cutting extraordinary loss (it is a trading calamity). I am still getting (quotations of) the price current in Madras and Bengal and consulting my companions and sale is to be made according to the conditions the country now offers, be it profit or loss, for unloading the ship and securing freight for Bengal which will be of greater utility and offer better prospects of trade. Generally it is inconvenient to carry from one country to another a commodity consumed by the greater part of each land. For instance I cannot take sugar to Bengal for it is the country that produces (that article). I am for this reason obliged to unload (sugar) in this coast, namely Negapatam, Nagore and Madras, according to the condition of the country (market) for making my voyage from here and take such freights as I may find and get fresh cargo for Bengal. The price of arecas, though an esteemed article in these coasts, is so low now that at the highest it is 10 pagodas per Bhar.[26] I suppose

26 (From Sanskrit *bharo*—load). A weight used in large transaction. In Madras it was reckoned equal to 480 lbs. avoirdupois. The word is also spelt as *bahar, baar, barom* in contemporary Eurasian literature. (Thornton—*East Indian Calculator*, p. 458; *Hobson-Jobson;* Legan, *Op. cit.* III. 348).

I shall be obliged to sell areca at Madras, for it seems that Chiquiny areca is not liked in Bengal; but in case I cannot sell I shall be compelled to carry it to Bengal. If the loss of this year, be it on land or from the wetting of the goods or from the extent of the war which broke out from the time of my arrival is considered, it is certain that we shall make nothing (no profit) and Your Lordship will form a very bad opinion of this servant, as His Majesty has issued plenary orders for the disposal of every thing according as the condition of the country permits.

Of the French fleet only one frigate La Gibele, Captain Magan, anchored at Trankebar for only one day; it then left this place and had been coasting from Tranquebar to Negapatam for about 12 days, it could not possibly go to Pondicherry as that port is watched by the English fleet consisting of three Company's ships armed for fighting and Commodore Cornwallis's[27] frigate, I do not know where it is gone now. The frigate is very strong, well-provided with many soldiers and negroes and very light but fighting has not commenced at Pondicherry as yet, only the French are firing so that the adjacent batteries may not be damaged. The boat of a French Captain that had taken Danish flag and passport in the name of Mr. Pingel, who is now Captain, was arrested at Madras, but was released by letters that went from Tranquebar.

I send a paper of the account of the sale made by the ship to be kept (by you), as it is a necessary formality.

Delivered the flags of the ship to Maracan Aly Amod of Almadia do Santiago de Taliseira which touched this port and have asked them to deliver (these) in our Serang's house and from there take a known man to carry and deliver (them) to the palace.

Captain Quinzemil was robbed and murdered by a French Corsair on the way to Bengal, so runs the rumour (news).

The Gurab left Negapatam on the 9th instant for Trankebar. I ordered that nine salutes should be fired on the arrival at that port to which the fortress replied in the like manner. I remained at Negapatam for five days more with a view to receiving cash and finishing payment.

Estrella[28]—Should have sent this boat much earlier to reach that port and to set out from there. It will be politic if Denmark having given me their flag and passport also treats with me about them. I also thought that some business might be done, but for sugar they ask 20-22 pagodas wholesale. As the weight will be heavy and the duties also are high I did not make any purchase. On this account I propose to leave for Madras to-morrow.

I send also two lists of goods sold at Negapatam and to the merchants of Nagore.

On the 14th inst. it rained at night at Tranquebar and four feet of water rose in the street, if the rain had continued a few hours longer it would have caused

27 Sir William Cornwallis, brother of Lord Cornwallis and Commander-in Chief of His Majesty's Squadron in the East Indies. The frigate referred to is Minerva.

28 Name of a ship?

much damage. These are the news that I can communicate to Your Lordship for the present. Hope that when this letter is received Your Lordship will enjoy perfect health and expect that Your Lordship will out of his goodness communicate every thing to his royal Majesty and obtain a favourable order.

As professed I am and have the honour to remain
Your Lordships obedient and devoted servant,
A. B. Da Cruz
Tranquebar, 17th August 1793.

6. (No. 5 of the bound volume)

Madras 13 September, 1793.

Most Excellent Senhor,

Your Lordship may have learnt of my arrival at this port and other news from the letter of the 22nd ultimo. After my arrival here I obtained information about prices and am convinced that it is very necessary to sell in order to make room in the boat for taking cargo to Bengal and also not to keep money locked. For various reasons I could not wait for orders. To keep 300 fardos of areca means loss of place for 1,000 bags of rice, i.e. ¼ of the cargo of the boat from which greater profit is (derived); so from various considerations sales were made the price list of which is herewith enclosed. Company's letter of credit is not avaliable, coins have good currency in Bengal, 330 Arcott Rupees fetch 100 pagodas. At last took from Messrs Porcher Bedhead[29] letter of credit at the rate of 350 Arcott Rupees per 100 pagodas for 21,546 Rupees in lieu of 5,700 pagodas.[30] The freighters have given two thousand pagodas by Mutien Chetty (two thousand pagodas which correspond to Bengal credit of about seventeen hundred). Besides (the ratio of) pagoda to Pataca is one pataca for 10 pagodas and 15⅞ dollars per pataca.

About the muskets which His Majesty had ordered to secure at Madras I was told that they will not sell without receipt of His Majesty's letter and secondly I cannot have them on board the ship on account of the war as it is contrary to law.

The only news that I can give Your Lordship is that Lord Cornwallis arrived at Madras on the 7th instant, also General Abercromby has arrived from Bombay on the 1st of September. Mr. Pony arrived and Pondichery was captured on the 22nd ultimo and all the French prisoners have been brought to Madras but it is said that better order prevails at Pondichery now than before. As I am embarking to-day on my way to Bengal I am very busy, with God's favour on my safe arrival

29 Should read 'Porcher and Redhead.' The full name of the firm was Messrs. Porcher, Redhead and Gardiner (Pub. Cons., 17 January 1793, no. 3).

30 The figures given here seem to be all wrong. 5,700 pagodas at the rate 3½ rupees each equal 19,950 rupees and 2,000 pagodas at the same rate would fetch 7,000 and not 1,700 rupees.

there shall write more clearly (lit. shall express myself) to Your Lordship. Hope Your Lordship will kindly communicate to His Majesty the dispositions of his servant.

I remain etc.
A. B. Da Cruz

7 (No. 4 of the bound volume)

Calcutta, 2nd November, 1793.

Most Excellent Sir,

Received Your Lordship's most respected message of the 27th ultimo in reply to mine from Tranquebar and Madras and remain thereby informed about every thing I have been ordered. As for the goods that you ask me to purchase if it is convenient in Bengal there cannot be the least doubt that I on my part shall trade in what may be convenient according to mode and time. These being still uncertain I have given information about my arrival and other news by the Tapal[31] (post) of the 12th and the 18th instant and believe that they reached you before this. The news that I can now give to Your Lordship is that the charge of the Government of Calcutta was taken on the 26th instant (sic) in the name on the margin (Hon'ble Sir John Shore Baronet), Lord Cornwallis left Madras for London on the 10th October, these (news) they say are reliable. But the news about the French are all hearsay and nothing is certain, except it is said that Corsairs and Frennch frigates are in the east coast. The Hunter, Captain Gallaway on its way from Pegu after entering the river (at) Culpy[32] ran aground and the ship was lost.

As regards a commander for the Sivengy I am exerting myself in various ways but it is difficult to find (one), for there is none in Calcutta and I have recommended it to several (parties) promising rewards to see whether one can be obtained. Am ever awaiting the orders that may be despatched to your servant and informing his royal majesty that I profess to remain.

Unless and most obedient servant
A. B. Da Cruz
Sabbath Day (Saturday)

8 (No. 6 of the bound volume).

Most Excellent Sir
at Cochin.

Your Lordship may have learnt the circumstances of my arrival at this colony from three letters written before. As the sale of rice is prohibited in foreign

31 Usually spelt as 'tappal' or 'tappaul'—see *Hobson-Jobson*.

32 Kulpi, village on the Hugli about 50 miles below Calcutta.

ports except ports of the English and that also on offering surety for not touching any other port whatever and as there is no heavy goods that may be of any use for cargoing the ship I resolved to make an application with the above intent to the Council chamber of this court from which I received a favourable dispatch a copy of which goes enclosed for Your Lordship's better information. Consequently I cannot sell the cargo of rice at all at Galle or Colombo without the order of His Majesty so that I may not offend him or the surety by which I have to abide for I am required immediately on my arrival to send His Majesty's assurance that the rice was unloaded at Cochin. As for the security of the goods and the ships Your Excellency may be informed that I am here arming six boats for cruising the sea which will be brief. My departure from this port shall take place in December. In this connection I hope that Your Lordship after informing His Majesty will quickly despatch orders sending me two letters one at Galle and the other at Colombo so that I may get them on my arrival and landing at the said ports to acquaint myself whether I should sell the entire cargo or a part or not (nothing at all). In anticipation I have kept one part (in such a way) that can be taken out. However I hope that the reply to this Your Lordship will quickly send to the said ports without failure.

I remain one who has the honour of being a useless,
humble and obedient servant
A. B. Da Cruz.
Calcutta 23 November 1793.

P. S. Have a new report that there are French boats at Balasore, therefore the merchantmen that had got ready are stopped on the information and report of Capt. Turner. A Siren has this moment been explained to me in this manner.

9. (No. 7 of the bound volume)

Most Excellent Senhor,
at Cochin

I despatched a letter to Your Lordship on the 23rd instant addressed to Sr Mesr. Rahabby which Your Lordship may have ere this received and been informed of all things. I now inform Your Lordship that the paper that I gave to the Company was one of surety (about the carrying of rice) undertaking not to sell in ports other than that of Cochin for His Majesty and shall be obliged to send proof of the rice being unloaded at the said port of Cochin, otherwise there will be a penalty of 49 thousand rupees. These terms were not for me alone, but were in general for all who take cargo here.

Thus the ship has begun loading cargo. Hope that Your Lordship will inform His Majesty of every thing and communicate quickly to me in Ceylon and Galle his order and what instructions there may be for this servant of his to execute.

I remain etc.
A. B. Da Cruz
28th November 1793.

10.

To

The Most Illustrious Majesty of the King of Cochin.

Sir,

After having lived so many years in this land in peace and amity, having personal acquaintance with you and all the principal personages of this country, I am now obliged to express sentiments to Your Majesty on account of the incivility of your people in expelling me out of the island of this place, where I had set up a small house for protecting me from the sun in day time and for quiet of the night, with a view to embarking in a boat I am awaiting, considerable property belonging to me and other respectable English merchants which I have been collecting for several months. Your people, for what cause or reason I do not know, came and demolished my little house and left me no place for protection against sun. For this alone I have to inform Your Majesty that this conduct of your people in causing me the above mentioned trouble I consider very injurious to myself and my nation as well as to His Majesty Ram Rajah[33] under whose protection I actually consider myself. Your Majesty have always expressed the greatest friendship for me. I cannot therefore perceive what may be the reason of this insult to a man who never offended Your Majesty or any of your people, Wishing Your Majesty's health, long life and happiness, I desire to remain for ever,

Sincere friend of Your Majesty,
Alexander W. Nicoll (?)

Aycotta, 4th December 1793.

11.

Most Excellent Senhor,

I inform Your Lordship that to-day the 31st December by God's grace I have left the port of Calcutta and expect, God willing, on my arrival at the port of Galle of (sic)[34] Colombo to obtain in Your Lordship's letters instructions relating to His Majesty's orders. But I had not the honour of receiving replies to any of the several letters written from this port. Finally as my departure from this port has been postponed for long I do not want to extend it further and pray to be excused.

I beg Your Lordship to communicate to His Majesty about my sail and departure for the present. I tender only my profound respects which being professed.

I remain
the devoted and obedient servant of Your Lordship
A. B. Da Cruz.

Calcutta, 31 December 1793.

33 Probably Rama Varma—Raja of Travancore (1758-1798).
34 Read 'Galle and Colombo.'

12.

To

The Captain and Super Cargo of the Ghurab of
His Majesty the King of Cochin
Andre Bartolomeos Da Cruz.

Received at Cochin your letter written from Calcutta on the 23rd of October together with a copy of the petition to the Supreme Council of the same place wherein I find your observation about carrying rice and also that you wish that His Majesty's order should be obtained for selling rice and other goods at Galle and in Ceylon and that two letters of the same purport should be despatched one to Galle and the other to Colombo so that you may carry out that order with complete confidence (lack of doubt). I have already communicated the entire substance of your letter to His Majesty who was greatly pleased with your conduct in the service and ordered me to write to you that in case you have to leave Bengal in December and reach the ports of Galle and Ceylon by the end of that month you can sell all the rice and other goods that can be disposed of there and take other merchandise that can be sold at Cochin or bring cash with all care and come here with the greatest expedition. If you are well-acquainted with the conditions that were imposed in Bengal about freighting rice take all care that no murmurs may be caused on that account, and make speed to sell the said 500 bags of rice in Galle and Ceylon with all articles that may find a sale there, buy others that (may find sale) are in demand at Cochin and come here with all quickness. Meanwhile may God protect you. Cochin 31st December 1793.

Was the Buddha a Theist?

The preachings of Gautama the Buddha are perhaps India's few of the greatest gifts to the world. In the cultural history of the East, the doctrine of this preacher has had a similar effect on the religious and philosophical thought, as the teaching of Jesus has had in the West. He was born in an age when India was in great need of earnest leaders to divert the attention of the people of the place from superstitious and ritualistic ceremonials and wasteful sacrifices.

For a period of about fortyfive years, Gautama and his followers went from place to place, preaching their philosophy to the peoples of Aṅga, Magadha, Vajji, Malla, Kāsi, Kosala, Cedi, Vatsa, Matsya, Śūrasena, Kuru, Pañcāla, Sivi, Daśārṇa, Assaka and Avanti. They had no occasion, it seems, to stir outside the limits of the middle country, due to the great and insistent demand over there.[1]

Studying perfectly well the thoughts of his age, Gautama knew that the two extreme paths followed by the people of the time for a religious life viz. self-indulgence and self-mortification, were wrong. The perfect way was the middle path.[2] He moreover, understood and so preached, the four truths of the world about sorrow, the cause of sorrow, the extinction of sorrow, and the path leading to the extinction of sorrow.[3]

The Buddha knew and was convinced that the earth was a vale of misery, and the world nothing but a mass of pain. Birth is sorrow. Decay is sorrow. Sickness is sorrow. Death is sorrow. To be conjoined to things which we dislike, to be separated from things we like,—that also is sorrow. Not to get what one wants,—that too is sorrow. Conflict, in short, is the root cause of all the miseries of man in the world.

After finding out the sorrow of this world, the great "knower", knowing as a great logician that every effect has a cause, started to search for its cause. With a search in the right direction he knew that the very desire to live or the craving for existence is the cause of the sorrow or

1 Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. xv.

2 *Mahāvagga*, I, 6, 17; *Majjhima Nikāya*, II, Araṇa-Vibhaṅga Sutta, p. 230.

3 *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Sabbāsava Sutta, p. 9; Mahāhatthipadopama Sutta pp. 184-85.

miseries of this world. "There is no fire like desire,..." states the *Dhammapada*.[4] Cravings and desires bind the soul, as if in chains, and reduce it to a servitude from which it would fain escape. This thirst or desire that leads to re-birth, accompanied by pleasure and lust, is the real cause of suffering or sorrow upon this earth.

The simple principle of cause and effect that governs the whole universe applies to the events of human life also. The Buddha accepts the already established principle of *karma* and rebirth. According to the law of *karma*, the "doing" of a man cannot die,[5] but must necessarily lead to its legitimate result. "Evil doers," according to the *Dhammapada*, "go to hell, righteous people to heaven."[6] One is thus rewarded or punished in the next world in agreement with his deeds in this world. Man is for ever fashioning himself. He can never escape the consequences of his deeds. As he acts so shall he be. So when a man dies, he is reborn according to the *karma* (doing) of his previous birth. In other words, the outward condition of the soul is, in each new birth, determined by its actions in the previous birth. It is, thus, the craving that leads from rebirth to rebirth, accompanied by lust and passion; it is the craving for the gratification of the passions, the craving for continued existence, the lust for present delight, that is the chief cause of sorrow. The thirst that leads to rebirth is the real cause of suffering. He is a thoughtless man who "runs from life to life like a monkey seeking fruit in the forest."[7] Existence cannot continue without the clinging to life, just as fire cannot continue without fuel.[8].

Knowing the cause of suffering, Gautama the Buddha, speaks about the cessation of suffering, which ceases with the complete cessation of thirst or craving for this existence. The total annihilation of this very craving, the forsaking of, complete deliverance from it, is the real path of the cessation of this sorrow.

And what is the true path that leads to the cessation or annihilation of this sorrow? It is the noble Eight-fold path—path that consists of (i)

4 *Dhammapada*, XVIII, 251.

5 *Mahābhārata*, Śāntiparva, 348, Cf. *Gautama Dharma Śāstra*, XIX, 5; *Vaśiṣṭha Dharma Śāstra*, XXII, 4.

6 *Dhammapada*, IX, 126; Cf. *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, Aggañña Suttanta, pp. 83-97.

7 *Dhammapada*, XXIV, 334.

8 Cf. *Saṁyutta Nikāya*, II, 12, 53.

right belief, (ii) right aims, (iii) right speech, (iv) right action, (v) right mode of livelihood, (vi) right effort, (vii) right mindfulness, and (viii) right meditation.[9] It is this middle path alone that leads to *Nirvāṇa,* "salvation or emancipation" which "knows neither rebirth nor decay, neither disease nor death, neither sorrow nor impunity,"[10] it is that 'eternal deliverance' from which it is wholly impossible to fall.[11] Nirvāṇa is, according to the *Dhammapada,* "an unchangeable place,"[12] where there being no rebirth there is no suffering.

The doctrine of *karma,* as we find in Buddhism,[13] is one of the basic points of the philosophy of the earlier Upaniṣad and Sāṃkhya schools,[14] e.g. in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* we find that man, indeed, is reborn pure by pure deeds, and is reborn evil by evil deeds.[15] The *Praśna Upaniṣad* also states that in consequence of good work (*puṇya*) one goes to the good world (heaven); in consequence of evil (*pāpa*), to the evil world (hell); in consequence of both, to the world of men.[16]

The Buddha clearly states in the Kukkura-vatika-Sutta of the *Majjhima Nikāya,* that "creatures are the heirs of their own actions,"[17] and that what they do, determines what they pass to.[18] "My action", says he, "is my possession: my action is my inheritance: my action is the matrix which bears me: my action is the race to which I belong: my action is my refuge; whatever deed I do, whether good or bad., I shall become heir to it".[19] Even the words of Raṭṭhapāla, in the Sutta of his

9 *Mahāvagga,* I, 6, 18; *Digha Nikāya,* I, Mahāli Sutta. p. 157; Kassapa Sihanāda Sutta, p. 165; II, Mahā-satipaṭṭhāna Suttanta, pp. 311-12; *Majjhima Nikāya,* II, Araṇa-vibhaṅga Sutta, p. 231.

10 *Majjhima Nikāya,* I, Ariyapariyesana Sutta, p. 166.

11 *Ibid.,* I, Mahāsāropama Sutta, p. 197.

12 *Dhammapada,* XVII, 225.

13 'Buddhism' during the time of its preacher, was not a religion as such but merely an order. It is a misnomer to call it by the above term especially when talking about the period of Gautama himself.

14 Keith, *The Sāṅkhya System,* p. 26.

15 *Chāndogya Upaniṣad,* III, 14, 1; Cf. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad,* III, 2, 13; IV, 4. 5; *Kaṭha Upaniṣad,* V, 13; *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad,* I, 2; Cf. *Bhagavad Gitā,* XVIII, 12.

16 *Praśna Upaniṣad,* III, 7. 17 *Majjhima Nikāya,* I, p. 390. 18 *Ibid.*

19 *Aṅguttara Nikāya,* III, 57, 2 and 8; Cf. Radhakrishnan, *Gautama the Buddha,* p. 16; "The Teaching of the Buddha by Speech and by Silence", *Hibbert Journal,* XXXII, p. 349.

name, describing the state of a king hereafter and stating that "he passes hence to fare hereafter as his deserved,"[20] go to corroborate the same, viz., the Buddha's belief in the *karma* theory.

The *karma* theory again, is itself the cause of the transmigration of the soul. They being thus interrelated as cause and effect cannot be independent as Rhys Davids supposes.[21] "Buddhism," says the scholar, "swept away from the field of its vision the whole of the great soul theory......"[22] "The ignoring of the soul", he continues, "is the most important fact in the comparative study of Buddhism."[23] But the absence of the word 'soul' *ātmā* as such, in the Piṭakas,[24] does not prove the disbelief of the Buddha in the same. According to the theory of *karma*, on the other hand, one is rewarded or punished in the next world in agreement with his deeds in this world. Who is to be rewarded or punished in the next world if the soul is not there? The material body can never reach the next world, it being prone to destruction. The law of *karma*, thus, cannot be of any effect without the existence of the soul immortal. When asked by Kūṭadanta: "Does the venerable Gotama admit that he who celebrates such a sacrifice, or causes it to be celebrated, is reborn at the dissolution of the body, after death, into some state of happiness in heaven?" "Yes O Brāhmaṇa, that I admit",[25] was the calm reply of Gautama.

Life, according to the theory of transmigration, is a long chain of existences; and the Buddha preached to the people to escape from this chain, to attain to a condition that will be outside the circle of this change, outside the reach of the causes of change, and which will contain within itself the element of finality. The only such condition is, according to the Buddha, that state of mind in which the craving and desire shall have ceased; no new link will then be formed in the chain of existence; the *karma* will cease to influence; and there shall be no more birth.[26] This

20 *Majjhima Nikāya*, II, p. 73; *satto pana gacchati yena kammam.*

21 *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion*, (Hibbert Lectures, 1881), pp. 83, 91, 93-94.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 29; Cf. Kern, *The Manual of Buddhism*, p. 11.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 30; Cf. Ray, "Origin of Buddhism", *IHQ.*, VI, p. 665.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 91.

25 *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, Kūṭadanta Sutta, p. 143; (Tr. by Rhys Davids).

26 Cf. *Dīgha Nikāya*, II, Mahā Satipatthāna Suttanta, p. 307; III. Dasuttara Suttanta, p. 275.

state is Nirvāṇa. In the words of Kassapa "the state of Nirvāṇa is a state of rest, but that rest cannot be found as long as we live under the empire of senses and passions. That rest excludes existence, birth, old age and death; the great mental attainments alone lead thereto."[27]

We would not like to go into details about the exact meaning of the term 'Nirvāṇa', not only because it has been already explained by innumerable scholars in different ways, but also because the short space at our disposal does not allow it. Nirvāṇa in its fullest and strictest meaning, is nothing but a perfect union of the soul with the Divine or Brahmā.[28] Therefore it can never be possible here in this world. The union with Brahmā cannot be but spiritual, though perfectly real. A material body can never be perfectly united with a spiritual being as Brahmā is. The bodies have an end but the soul is permanent and idestructible.[29] Therefore the human body cannot obtain this perfect union with the Divine. How can the human soul, still bound to the body in this life, be perfectly united with the Supreme in this world? It is only after death, when the soul is separated from the body, and is thus free, that the perfect union with Brahmā is possible. The soul is the only element in our body which comes directly from Brahmā and so through which alone, we can approach Brahmā.[30] The Tevijja Sutta of the *Dīgha Nikāya* clearly states "that the Bhikkhu who is free from anger, free from malice, pure in mind, and master of himself should, after death, when the body is dissolved, become united with Brahmā,......such a condition of things is in every way possible".[31] With a man attaining Nirvāṇa "what binds him to being is cut".[32] It is only after the dissolution of the body that one is reborn in some happy state in heaven.[33]

27 *Vide* Bigandet, *The Life and Legend of Gautama the Buddha of the Burmese*, p. 143.

28 *Taittiriya Upaniṣad*, II, 1-5; *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, Brahmajāla Sutta, pp. 34-36; cf. Schrader, "On the Problem of Nirvāṇa, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, 1905, p. 169; Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 451; Radhakrishnan, *Gautama the Buddha*, pp. 25-26.

29 *Bhagavad Gītā*, II, 18; Cf. *Mahābhārata*, Śāntiparva, 12887.

30 Barua, *History of pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, p. 66.

31 *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, p. 252; Cf. *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Māra Tajjaniya Sutta, p. 336; Vallabha, *Anubhāṣya*, p. 244.

32 *Ibid.*, I, Brahmajāla Sutta, p. 36: *ucchinnabhavanettiko.*

33 *Ibid.*, II, Janavasabha Suttanta, p. 212; Sakka Pañha Suttanta, p. 271; Pāyāsi Suttanta, p. 357; III, Udumbarika Sīhanāda Suttanta, p. 52; *Majjhima*

But finding the state of perfect Nirvāṇa in the next world, as seen above, it is very strange to find references in several passages of Buddhist literature to the Nirvāṇa in this world.[34] This Nirvāṇa of this world is not the perfect Nirvāṇa, viz. the union of the soul with Brahmā, as we have seen before. The Nirvāṇa of this world is simply the freedom from all the worldly desires[35] and end of all pain.[36] On being asked by Ānanda to explain the occasions on which the colour of the skin of a Tathāgata becomes clear and bright, the Buddha replies: "On the night......on which a Tathāgata attains to the supreme and perfect insight [in this world], and on the night in which he passes finally away in that utter passing away which leaves nothing whatever to remain" [hereafter].[37] Similarly the Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda-Suttanta refers to a state of happiness here and rebirth in the heavenly worlds.[38] The Buddha himself argues that one who does not know happiness here, cannot state that the soul is happy in the next world.[39] There is success both in this world and in the next.[40] It is, thus, only when one attains to Nirvāṇahood in this world, that he can obtain the perfect Nirvāṇahood in the other world. The second one is simply the continuation of the first.[41] Thus Buddhism in the words of Nariman, "sees in salvation or Nirvāṇa the supreme bliss and in the conception of Arhatship, which is already in this life a forestate of the coming Nibbāṇa, the end and goal of all sufferings."[42]

Nikāya, I, Bhaya-Bherava Sutta, pp. 22-23; Cūla-Dhamma Samādāna Sutta, pp. 307-309; II, Raṭṭhapāla Sutta, p. 73 etc.

34 *Ibid.*, II, Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, p. 153; III, Udumbarika Suttanta, pp. 55-56; *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Mahā Sihanāda Sutta, p. 71; Ariyapariyesana Sutta pp. 172, 175; Cūlahatthipadopama Sutta, p. 177; Potaliya Sutta p. 307; Tevijja Vacchagotta Sutta, p. 482; Mahā Vacchagotta Sutta, p. 496; II, Mahā Sakuladāyi Sutta, p. 22; *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, III, 6, 55, etc.

35 *Dhammapada* IX, 126; Cf. Rhys Davids, *op. cit.*, 1881, pp. 99, 100, 206.

36 *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Sammā-Diṭṭhi Sutta, p. 47: *diṭṭhe...dhamme dukkhassa antakaro hoti;* Cf. Sekha Sutta, pp. 357-58.

37 *Digha Nikāya*, II, Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, pp. 134; 136.

38 *Ibid.*, III, p. 66; Cf. Aggañña Suttanta, pp. 83, 84, 93, 95-97; *Jātaka*, II, p. 430.

39 *Ibid.*, I, Poṭṭhapāda Sutta, p. 192.

40 *Ibid.*, I, Sigālovāda Suttanta, p. 181; Cf. *Majjhima Nikāya* II, Brahmāyu Sutta, p. 143.

41 Elliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, I, p. 223.

42 *The Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*, p. 3.

As can be seen in the Tevijja Sutta of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, a Brahman cannot be united with Brahmā or the Supreme in the next world, if first he does not become like Brahmā in this world.[43] By himself becoming Brahmā, as the *Bhagavadgītā* also states, a yogin attains Brahmā's bliss.[44] The Mahā-sāropama Sutta of the *Majjhima Nikāya* describes both the "temporary Deliverance," here and the "eternal Deliverance" hereafter.[45] "Those who go hence," according to the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, "without here having found the soul (ātman = Brahmā) and those real desires (*satya kāma*)—for them in all the worlds there is no freedom. But those who go hence having found here the soul and those real desires—for them in all worlds there is freedom."[46]

Transmigration, which is being given so much importance in the teachings of the Buddha, is a punishment, and so the cause of so much misery and fear. And the Buddha aimed at the destruction of this misery which was itself the outcome of the falling of man into the chain of rebirths. Both Nirvāṇas are the effect of the same cause viz. the destruction of the miseries of this world which are the craving for existence and the overcoming of the temptations which lead to the whirlpool of transmigration.

It was only the knowledge of God that could surely exempt a person from transmigration. "Whoever knows Brahmā" as the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* says, "will not be reborn at all."[47]

A double mistake, therefore, seems to have been committed by most of the scholars, western and eastern, in calling Buddhism, an atheistic or an agnostic religion.[48]

To call Buddhism a religion is the first mistake. It was not a religion as such[49] during the time of the Buddha, though it was raised to that status much later. At the early stage it "was a form of faith for ascetics

43 *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, pp. 247-48. 44 *Bhagavadgītā* V, 24.

45 *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, pp. 196-97.

46 *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VIII, 1, 6.

49 *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, III, 7; Cf. *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, I, 9, 3.

48 Elliot, *op. cit.*, I, p. 105; Keith, "The Buddha as a Master Mind", *Indian Culture*, V, p. 236; Rhys Davids, *Hibbert Lectures 1881*, p. 147; Barua, *History of pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, p. 215; Dutt, *A History of Civilization in Ancient India*, p. 281.

49 Cf. Monier Williams. "Buddhism in its Relation to Brahmanism" *JRAS.*, XVIII, p. 130; Jayaswal, "Hāthigumphā Inscription of the Emperor Khāravela,"

only, not a religious creed for all people."[50] The *Majjhima Nikāya* describes the Buddha as "the founder of a saving creed, not religion."[51] The Sonadanda Sutta of the *Dīgha Nikāya* also describes him as "the head of an order of a school, as the teacher of a school, the acknowledged chief of all the founders of sects."[52] He followed the ancient religion of the land, and by following its principles he was finally led to the creation of a monastic order. He never established a new religion.[53]

To call the Buddha an 'agnostic' or an 'atheist' is the second and very common mistake committed by most of the authors that have written on Buddhism.

During that time the spirit of speculation was fully at work. Moral life suffered, since metaphysical subtleties and theological discussions absorbed the energies of people. "It was" as Radhakrishnan states, "an age of speculative chaos, full of inconsistent theologies and vague wranglings."[54] And the Buddha is charged as being an agnostic or atheist only because he does not say or discuss or describe anything definite about God or about His mysteries and existence.

"Every system of thought," in the words of Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, "embodies and reflects the tendencies of the time, and cannot be understood unless we realise the point of view from which it looked at the world, and the habit of thought which made it possible."[55] At the very outset "the fact that Buddha felt that he was in possession of truth and could lead men on to it, militates against the view of agnosticism. If he did not know the truth," continues the learned philosopher, "he would not have considered himself to be a Buddha or the enlightened."[56]

Very often questions were being proposed to the Buddha about the fundamental mysteries of the universe, and he gave no answer. Such

JBORS., III, p. 447; Ball, "Wanted a Philosophy of Life Buddhism" *Buddhistic Studies*, p. 563, (ed. by Law).

50 Law, *Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India*, p. 68; Radhakrishnan, *Gautama the Buddha*, p. 21; Cf. Monier-Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-30; Sankalia, *The University of Nalanda*, p. 21.

51 *Majjhima Nikāya*, II, Mahā Sakuladāyi Sutta, p. 3.

52 *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, p. 116.

53 Cf. *JRAS.*, 1894, p. 588; Havell, *Aryan Rule in India*, p. 56; *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Cūḷa Saccaka Sutta, p. 234.

54 *Indian Philosophy*, I, 353.

55 *Ibid.*, I, p. 352.

56 *Ibid.*, I, p. 465; Cf. *Gautama the Buddha*, pp. 34-35.

discussions would not conduce to knowledge, peace, or freedom from passion he said. But nowhere, in early Buddhist literature, do we find any reference to doubts about the existence of God, much less any clear statement denying God's existence.[57] This does not mean in the least, that he did not know God or other things spiritual.[58] "Though Buddhism and the Upaniṣads," says Radhakrishnan, "refuse to see ultimate reality of substance or being in the changing sequence, the difference at most is that while the Upaniṣads assert a reality beyond change or becoming, Buddhism adopts a suspense of judgment on this question." "In no sense," continues the author, "is this healthy non-commital attitude to be construed into a denial of an ultimate being."[59] "If the Buddha declined to define the nature of this absolute," says the same author, "or if he contented himself with negative definitions, it is only to indicate that absolute being is above all determinations."[60] The Buddha avoided the discussion as it was not profitable in any way, for fostering the real spirit of his doctrine. "Those who believe that Buddha's silence was a cloak for nihilism, do not seem to rate highly his courage or character."[61]

Gautama knew more than what he told his disciples, as several passages of the Nikāyas clearly show.[62] In the *Saṃyutta Nikāya,* for example, he has frankly admitted that he did not reveal all the truths he knew. We find therein that he took a few *śiṃśapā* leaves and urged that as those did not exhaust the leaves of the whole forest, even so the truths he had announced were not all the truths that he had learned.[63] He even knew of things transcendental and the way that led to the state of bliss in heaven.[64]

57 Cf. Rhys Davids, "Silence and Emphasis in Buddhism," *Hibbert Journal,* XXXII, p. 129.

58 Cf. *Dīgha Nikāya,* I, Poṭṭhapāda Sutta, p. 188; *Majjhima Nikāya.* I, Cūḷa Mālumkyā Sutta, p. 431; Aggi Vaccagotta Sutta, p. 486; Radhakrishnan, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 564-65.

59 Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy,* I, p. 379; cf. p. 464.

60 Radhakrishnan, *Gautama the Buddha,* p. 46.

61 Radhakrishnan, "The Teaching of Buddha by Speech and by Silence," *Hibbert Journal,* XXXII, 351.

62 *Dīgha Nikāya,* I, Mahāli Sutta, p. 158; Poṭṭhapāda Sutta pp. 187-88; *Majjhima Nikāya,* I, Cūla Mālumkyā Sutta, p. 431.

63 *Saṃyutta Nikāya,* IV, 6, 31; Cf. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy,* I, p. 466.

64 *Majjhima Nikāya,* I, Mahā Sīhanāda Sutta, p. 73.

Now Nirvāṇa, the very gist of the Buddha's doctrine, and which is the perfect knowledge of the Supreme, or the union of the soul with Brahmā, as we have already seen, cannot be possible without the very existence of Brahmā.

We have also seen that the Buddha never looked upon himself as an innovator, but only a restorer of the ancient way i.e. the way of the Upaniṣads. The Māgandiya Sutta of the *Majjhima Nikāya* clearly states that the happiness of Nirvāṇa, which is the final goal of the doctrine, was preached even before the Buddha, by the wanderers of old or their teachers and even the teachers of the teachers.[65] The Buddhists believed in six previous Buddhas—Vipassi, Sikhi, Vessabhu, Kakusandha, Koṇāgamana and Kassapa; Gautama was the seventh;[66] and the Buddha himself talks of the four noble truths as forming a part of the teaching of the previous Buddhas and he had admitted that he himself was only their discoverer and not inventor.[67] The *Milindapañho* further corroborates this by quoting these words of the Buddha himself: "Now I perceived, O, brethren, the ancient way, the ancient path along which previous Buddhas walked."[68] And it was not necessary for him, therefore, to enter into fresh discussions about God. The belief in God was one of the common beliefs of the times. As mentioned in the Kaṇṇakatthala Sutta of the *Majjhima Nikāya*, when king Prasenajit of Kośala asked the Buddha: "Does Brahmā exist?" the latter replied: "Why ask such a question?" King Pirasenajit thereupon continued, "Does he, or does he not, return to life on earth?" And the Buddha replied that 'a malign Brahmā does; a benign Brahmā does not."[69]

The first reply of the Buddha to king Prasenajit's blunt question about the existence of Brahmā, viz. "Why ask such a question?" clearly shows that the query was out of date at the time. Everybody believed in the Supreme Being. As the same Sutta mentions later on this Brahmā is the same as the 'adhideva.'[70] And it was, again, due to this very belief that the king, taking the existence of Brahmā for granted, asked the second

65 *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, p. 509.

66 *Dīgha Nikāya*, II, Mahāpadāna Suttanta. p. 2 Cf. Radhakrishnan, "The Teaching of the Buddha by Speech and by Silence", *Hibbert Journal*, XXXII, p. 349.

67 *Therigāthā*, 487-93; cf. Radhakrishnan, *op. cit.*, XXXII, p. 343.

68 *SBE.*, XXX, pp. 13-14; cf. *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, Cakkavatti Sihanāda Suttanta, pp. 58, 77.

69 *Majjhima Nikāya*, II, p. 132.

70 *Ibid.*

question: "Does he or does he not, return to life on Earth?" Readers might take this second question of the king to the Buddha to disprove the common belief of the existence of the Supreme Brahmā. But the second question of the king does not refer to Brahmā, the Supreme, but the Brahmā of this world, viz. the man who has attained to Brahmahood here. This is confirmed by another passage of the Aggañña Sutta of the *Dīgha Nikāya*. On being told that only the Brāhmaṇas are genuine children of Brahmā, born of his mouth offspring of Brahmā, created by Brahmā and the heirs of Brahmā, the Buddha says: "Surely...the Brāhmaṇas have quite forgotten the past when they say so. On the contrary," as he continues further, "the wives of Brāhmaṇas are known to be fertile, are seen to be with child, bringing forth and nursing children. And yet it is these very womb-born Brāhmaṇas who say that...Brāhmaṇas are genuine children of Brahmā, born from His mouth; His offspring, His creation, and His heirs! By this they blaspheme Brahmā."[71] Without his belief in Brahmā the Buddha would not have uttered the above words as a reproach to the Brāhmaṇas.

On the contrary, had Gautama been an atheist, he had to state his negation of God, as it was something uncommon in those days. No one asked the Buddha to prove the doctrine of rebirth as it was assumed as part of the common belief.[72] In the same way there was no need to explain the existence of God, it being a common belief of the times.

Gautama believed in the law of '*karma*', as we have seen before. By believing in the law of *karma*, he definitely believed in the fruit of the sins and virtuous actions after man's death. A deed of a person cannot be declared as a sin or a meritorious action unless there existed a moral law; and for the universal idea of sin and good deeds, as the Buddha had, there ought to have been in existence a universal moral law according to which man's actions should be judged and sanctioned. Even a king who did not obey the uivetsal law went to terrible hell,[73] for according to the Buddha even a *rājā* who was a world-monarch was bound by Dhamma.[74] Can there be a law without a law giver? Can there be a universal law without

71 *te Brahmānaū cétc'evana abbhācikkhanti:* *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, p. 82; cf. Grimm, "Brahman and Dhamma". *The Mahā-Bodhi*, XXX. p. 401.

72 Cf. Hewitt, "Notes on the Early History of Northern India", *JRAS.*, 1888, pp. 362-63; Radhakrishnan, *op. cit.*, I. p. 361.

73 *Mahābhārata*, Śāntiparva, 2555.

74 *Anguttara Nikāya*, III, 2. 14.

a universal law-giver? That law giver is the Brahmā of the Buddhist literature, the Ātman of the Upaniṣads i.e. God, who has power to impose sanctions on the breakers of the law even in the other world, according to the law of *karma*. The absoluteness of the moral law which the Buddha assumes does require a central spirit about which he seems to be silent. Thus in the law of *karma* itself "there is," as Radhakrishnan states, "the implication of the existence of the Highest."[75]

The Buddha has repeatedly mentioned that the source of all world miseries was the lack of knowledge. It was the lack of understanding and insight into the four holy truths.[76] And one has, therefore, to try to get as near to wisdom and goodness as one can by elimianting ignorance.[77] It is by the vision acquired through wisdom that the cankers of a *bhikkhu* are eradicated.[78] "Tranquil is his thought, tranquil are his word and deed, who," according to the *Dhammapada*, "has been freed by 'true knowledge,' who has become a tranquil man."[79] The Aggañña Suttanta again, repeats the same thought when it says that a Bhikkhu, an Arhant, gets perfect happiness when he has the 'perfected knowledge.'[80] The ascetic, according to the Mahāli Sutta, got his final happiness, only when there arose in him 'knowledge of emancipation.'[81] Thus, the very ultimate goal of the preaching of the Buddha viz. Nirvāṇa, which is the complete dissolution of rebirth or the union of the soul with Brahmā, is the result of the perfect knowledge, which is, according to the Buddha, the "knowledge of the four noble truths."[82]

But what is this knowledge which is styled as 'true" or 'perfected' or 'the knowledge of emancipation', or 'of the four noble truths'? What is this 'clear intellect' that is being prayed for in the Upaniṣads?[83] What is

75 Radhakrishnan *op. cit.*, I, p. 355; Cf. p. 460; Radhakrishnan, *Gautama the Buddha*, p. 31.

76 *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, II, 12, 2-15; Dahlke, *Buddhist Essays*, p. 18.

77 Cf. *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, Dasuttara Suttanta p. 274.

78 *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Nivāpa Sutta, p. 160.

79 *Dhammapada*, VII, 90, 91, 96.

80 *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, p. 83; Cf. *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Mahāvacchagotta Sutta, p. 490.

81 *Ibid.*, I, p. 158; Cf. Maitra-Fick, *Social Organisation in North East India in Buddha's Time*, p. 78.

82 *Ibid.*, II, Mahā-Parinibbāna Suttanta, pp. 90, 122.

83 Cf. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, IV, 1 and 2.

this knowledge that frees one from the quality of darkness and ignorance and makes one competent to unite with the Supreme?[84]

This is the same knowledge as the knowledge of the Supreme who is "the highest repository of truth."[85] Brahmā is, to them who knows[86] "He who knows Brahmā, attains the highest"[87] or in other words, himself becomes Brahmā.[88] It is only after having acquired the knowledge of Brahmā that one is free from sin like a snake from its skin.[89] And one who possesses this knowledge, as is clearly stated in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad,* reaches his goal from which he is born no more.[90] The *Mahābhārata* seems to be more explicit about this when it says that those who do not wish to know the Supreme Being, are constrained to pass through numberless births and deaths;[91] but one who truly knows Him, is not born again, but goes to Him.[92]

But this knowledge is possible only through the Grace of the Supreme Being to be known.[93] It is Brahmā Himself who leads one across to the shore beyond ignorannce.[94] This ignorance is, e.g. to take all the creatures of the universe as permanent beings, while in fact they are transient; they are becomings.

We find several passages in Buddhist literature where the Buddha refers to the world of Brahmā,[95] which is incorporeal[96] and so reached, at the

84 Cf. *Mahābhārata,* Śāntiparva, 12884, 12888.

85 *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad,* III, 1, 6: *satyasya paramam nidhanam.*

86 *Sutta Nipāta,* 656: *Brahmā Sakko vijānatan ti* (P.T.S. p. 123).

87 *Taittirīya Upaniṣad,* II, 1: *brahmavidāpanoti param.*

88 *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad,* III, 2; Cf. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad,* IV, 4, 23, *Bhagavadgītā,* VII, 2, 18; XIV, 2; XVIII, 55.

89 *Praśna Upaniṣad,* V, 5; Curiously enough the same simile is reproduced with Sutta Nipāta, Uragavagga, Uragasutta no. 2.

90 III, 8.

91 *Mahābhārata,* Anuṣāsanika Parva, 1056.

92 *Ibid.,* Bhīṣma Parva, 1002.

93 *Kaṭha Upaniṣad,* II, 23; *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad,* III, 20; *Bhagavad-gītā,* XVIII, 56, 58 and 62.

94 *Praśna Upaniṣad,* VI, 8; VII, 2 and 18.

95 *Dīgha Nikāya,* I. Kevaddha Sutta, p. 220; II, Mahāgovinda Suttanta, p. 250; III, Pātika Sutta, p. 26; *Majjhima Nikāya,* I, Ākankheyya Sutta, p. 34; Mahā Sihanāda p. 72; Ariya Pariyesana Sutta, p. 168; Māra Tajjaniya Sutta, p. 337; II, Mahā Sakuladāyi Sutta, pp. 18-19.

96 *Majjhima Nikāya,* I, Apaṇṇaka Sutta, p. 410.

body's dissolution after death;[97] and which cannot exist without the existence of Brahmā. The Saṅgītī Suttanta of the *Dīgha Nikāya* describes three happy rebirths, one of which is of Brahmā group.[98] In the Tevijja Sutta again, the Buddha clearly says: "Brahmā I know,......and the world of Brahmā, and the path which leadeth unto it. Yea, I know it even as one who has entered the Brahmā-world, and has been born within it."[99] Even the description of Brahmā appears in the Kevaddha Sutta which says that He is "Brahmā, the Great Brahmā, the Supreme, the Mighty, the All-seeing, the Ruler, the Lord of all, the Controller, the Creator, the Chief of all, appointing to each his place, the Ancient of days, the Father of all that are and are to be."[100] The Aggañña Suttanta describes Him as the Eternal Youth.[101] This description is akin to those of the Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads where He is described as the Lord of beings, the Father and Friend of all living creatures, the Eternal, the All-pervading, Omnipresent, the Source of beings, the "Peaceful, Immortal, unaging, fearless and Supreme," "the origin of the past, the present, the all", and the Being or existent.[102] "This similarity of the conception about the idea of God, between the Buddhist and the Āranyaka-Upaniṣadic literatures, clearly shows the earlier belief of God being also admitted by the Buddha.

In the Brahmajāla Sutta, the Buddha, while stating some of the low arts of the recluses and the Brāhmaṇas for earning their livelihood by wrong means, mentions "the worship of the Great One as one of them.[103] Some may not understand here as to why the Buddha condemns this way of making money if he had not faith in God. But on the contrary, his condemnation for this type of money-making at the cost of a sacred cause, viz. the belief in God, clearly shows his belief in that 'Great One',

97 *Ibid.*, II, Makhādeva Sutta, p. 76.

98 *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, p. 218.

99 *Ibid.*, I, p. 249; *brahmānam piaham......pajānāmi brahmalokañca brahmaloka gāmininca paṭipadam yathā paṭipannoca brahmalokam uppanno tañca pajānāmīti;* Cf. *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, Māra Tajjaniya Sutta p. 337; II, Subha Sutta, p. 27.

100 *Ibid.*, I, p. 221; Cf. III, Tāṭika Suttanta, p. 29.

101 *Ibid.*, p. 97; Cf. II, pp. 241, 246.

102 *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, II, 5, 15 and 19; *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*, I, 1, 6; *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, II, 18; *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, III, 11; *Maitri Upaniṣad*, V, 1; VI, 17; *Praśna Upaniṣad*, V, 7; *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*, I, 1, 3 and 6; *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VIII, 7, 1; Cf. Barua, *History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, p. 65.

103 *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, p. 11.

that Supreme One, who reveals himself to the recluse.[104] and the *Dhammapada* is a further corroboration to this when it says: "With self well-subdued one obtains the Lord who is difficult to be obtained."[105]

Some scholars attempt to prove the theistic element of the faith by identifying the Brahman of the Veda with the Dhamma of the Buddha or with Nirvāṇa itself:[106] But just at the outset, Dhamma which led one to Nirvāṇa[107] and thus which was a means, could not be the same as the Nirvāṇa which was the end. About the identification of Nirvāṇa and Brahmā, Nirvāṇa may objectively be taken to be Brahmā Himself who is the supreme *ānanda* and the cause of all *nirvāṇa*.[108] But subjectively considered, 'nirvāṇa' is 'ānanda' itself felt by the blessed in Heaven or the world of Brahmā, or by whatever name one denominates it. "It was", as Schrader puts it, "the Buddha and no one else who made the doctrine of *anattā* a moral principle, and that not by denying the Absolute One, but presupposing it as the true self, the only reality."[109]

But we cannot, for these reasons, conclude that in the *Saṃgha* of the Buddha there were not atheists and agnostics in later times. The misinterpretation of the life and doctrine of the Buddha by some of his later disciples, and by modern (at times atheistic and agnostic) scholars, have thrown great darkness over the person of Gautama and over the meaning of his enterprises.

India has ceased to be the centre of her ancient glory any more, but she still holds, and proudly too, the soil in which the great doctrine of the Buddha was nurtured. Her reputation as the cradle of Buddhism continuing the ancient philosophical truths of India's religion, remains unshaken.

L. B. KENY

104 *Dīgha Nikāya,* I, Kevaddha Sutta, p. 221.

105 *Dhammapada,* 160: *attanā hi sudanena nāthan labhati dullabham.*

106 Cf. Grimm, 'Brahman and Dhamma' *The Mahā-Bodhi,* XXXV, p. 446; Bhagavat, *Patna University Readership Lectures,* 1924-25, pp. 178-79; Radhakrishnan, *Gautama the Buddha,* p. 39.

107 Bhagavat, *op. cit.,* p. 160.

108 *Taittirīya Upaniṣad,* II, 7.

109 Schrader "On the Problem of Nirvāṇa", *JPTS.,* 1904-5, p. 163.

The Constitution of the Licchavis of Vaiśālī

In the preamble to the *Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka* (No. 149) we have the following passage (I, 504, Fausböll's edition):—

Tattha niccakālam rajjaṃ kāretvā vasantānaṃ yeva rājūnaṃ sattasahassāni sattasatāni satta ca rājāno honti, tattakā yeva uparājāno tattakā senāpatino tattakā bhaṇḍāgārikā.

In Chalmers' version (*The Jātaka* etc., I, 316) it is translated as follows:—

"In that city there were always seven thousand seven hundred and seven kings to govern the kingdom and a like number of viceroys, generals and treasurers."

A different reading and version of the above are given by Dr. K. P. Jayaswal (*Hindu Polity*, I, 51 and *n*). He first reads this passage as follows:—

Tattha niccakālaṃ rajjaṃ kāretvā vasantānaṃ yeva rājūnam sattasahassāni sattasatāni satta ca [-] rājāno honti tattaka; ye va uparājāno tattakā senāpatino tattakā, tattakā bhaṇḍāgārikā.

In the light of this reading of the above text, Jayaswal comments as follows:—

"The rule (rajjaṃ) vested in the inhabitants (vasantānaṃ), 7707 in number, all of whom were entitled to rule (rājūnaṃ, 'kings'). They became Presidents (rājāno), Vice-Presidents (Upa-rājāno), Commanders-in-Chief (Senā-patino) and Chancellors of the Exchequer. What the Jātaka means to say is that the 7707 of the inhabitants, probably the foundation families, were the ruling class, that it is they who became (*honti*, 'become') the executive office-holders."

On the authority of the above text Jayaswal concludes in the same context that the President, the Vice-President, the Generalissimo and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were "the four highest administrative officers" and in fact "composed the cabinet or executive authority." Now, in the first place, Jayaswal's addition of another *tattakā* before *bhaṇḍāgārikā* is unsupported by any manuscript authority, nor does he show any reason for construing and explaining the same phrase *yeva* differently—first as *yeva* (=*eva*) and afterwards as *ye-va* (=*ye eva*)—in the course of the same

sentence.[1] In the second place, Jayaswal gives no reason for taking the word-stem *rājan* in two different senses in the same sentence—first in the sense of 'one entitled to rule' and afterwards in the sense of President.[2] Thirdly and lastly, Jayaswal's paraphrase 'They became Presidents etc.' ignores the well-known significance of *tattakā* in the sense of 'so large,' while it fails to account for *yeva* occurring immediately before *uparājāno*. The fact is that the natural reading and interpretation of the Jātaka text above-quoted would make it mean that the 7707 *rājans* lived at Vaiśālī and the number of *uparājans, senāpatis* and *bhaṇḍāgārikas* was the same in each case. As regards Jayaswal's view that the *rājan*, the *uparājan*, the *senāpati* and the *bhaṇḍāgārika* constituted the cabinet or the executive authority, it seems to be a mere hypothesis unsupported by facts. In so far as the monarchic State is concerned, the Jātaka evidence conclusively proves that the *rājan*, the *uparājan* etc. formed successive grades in the official hierarchy instead of forming a co-ordinate body.

Accepting the current reading and interpretation of the *Jātaka* passage in question, Dr. R. C. Majumdar (*Corporate Life in Ancient India*, 1st ed., pp. 93-94) writes as follows:—"While the number 7707 may be dismissed as a purely conventional one, it may be accepted that the supreme assembly of the State consisted of a pretty large number of members and must as such be held to be a popular one." Again, he says that the reference to the like number of viceroys, generals and treasurers "would imply that each member of the supreme assembly possessed a full suite of officers requisite for the administration of a State." "In other words the whole State consisted of a number of administrative units, each of which was a State in miniature by itself and possessed a complete administrative machinery. The business of the State as a whole was carried on by an assembly consisting of the heads of these States who were in their turn attended by their principal officers." Dr. Majumdar concludes with the observation that "those who are familiar with the Cleisthenian constitution of the city-state of Athens cannot fail to find its proto-type (*sic*) in the city of Vaiśālī."

1 Dr. Benoy Chandra Sen's statement (*Studies in the Jātakas*, p. 31, *JDL*., vol. xx, 1940) in criticism of the above reading of Jayaswal, viz. that "there is no *tattakā* after *rājāno honti* in our text," is a slip.

2 The rendering of *rājūnam* as 'kings' ignores the possessive case-ending.

The above view would evidently take the *Jātaka* passage to point to a unitary State with each member of the ruling assembly forming an administrative unit. With it may be compared the view of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (*Lectures on the Ancient History of India of the period from 650 to 325 B.C.*) which would make the Licchavi State in the light of the above passage a federation of small principalities. Dr. Bhandarkar writes (*Ibid*, p. 155):—

"What we may safely infer is that that the number of the kings constituting the Licchavi *gaṇa* was pretty large. It again seems that the Licchavi kings had each his separate principality where he exercised supreme power in certain respects...Nevertheless the *gaṇa* as a whole had power to kill, burn or exile a man from their *vijita* or kingdom which meant the aggregate of principalities of the different kings."[3] Again, he says (*Ibid*, pp. 167-68: "[The Licchavi *gaṇa*] was a federation of the chiefs of the different clans of a tribe who were also each the ruler of a small principality ...Each confederate principality maintained its separate autonomy in regard to certain matters and allowed the Saṃgha to exercise supreme and independent control in respect of others affecting the kingdom." Bhandarkar concludes by suggesting "some points of resemblance" between the constitution of the Licchavi Saṃgha and "the confederation of the German States called the German Empire."

In considering the above views, we may begin by stating that the circumstantial statements in the *Jātaka* text above quoted, admittedly belong to a late choronological stratum, while all references in the older and more authentic canonical tradition describe the Licchavi constitution in very general terms simply as *saṃgha* or *gaṇa*. There are therefore grave reasons for doubting the genuineness of the later account. Assuming the *Jātaka* tradition to be based upon fact, what are the conclusions that we can safely draw from the same? To us it seems that the first portion of the *Jātaka* passage above quoted should be literally translated as follows:—

"Of the *rājans* who lived there (*scill.* in Vesālī) permanently exercising

3 Dr. Bhandarkar evidently translates *jāpetum* in the original (*Majj. Nikāya*, I, 231) as 'to burn'. But, as *P. T. S. Dictionary*, s.v. *jayati* notes, *jāpetum* in the above is connected with *jāpayati*, causative of *jayati* and meaning 'to cause to rob, to incite to plunder' Chalmers (*Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, 165) translating the above passage, similarly renders *jāpetum* as 'to mulct.' Probably Bhandarkar's rendering is due to the natural confusion of *jāpeti* with *jhāpeti* meaning 'to set on fire'.

sovereign rights, there were 7707 *rājans*." This would mean that 7707 nobles (*rājans*) lived at the capital, exercising sovereign power for life. The above interpretation appears to be corroborated to some extent by a parallel passage in the Jātakas. In the Preamble to the *Cullakāliṅga Jātaka* (Fausböll's edition, III, 1), we read:—

Vesāliaṃ kira Licchavirājūnaṃ sattasahassāni sattasatāni satta ca Licchavī vasiṃsu.

We take this to mean that according to tradition 7707 Licchavis among the Licchavi nobles had their residence at Vesāli.[4] It follows from the above that 7707 nobles resident at Vaiśālī were traditionally held to enjoy their supreme authority for life. When it is stated that the number 7707 occurring in the above text may be dismissed as a purely imaginary one,[5] it may be asked why the number should be precisely fixed at this figure[6] and not, as might be expected, in round numbers. At any rate, the possibility is not ruled out that the foundation-families of nobles taking up their abode at Vaiśālī numbered 7707 and this continued to be known as their traditional number ever afterwards. In the next place, the reference to the 7707 resident nobles exercising sovereign power for life implies that there were other nobles (*rājans*) occupying a less privileged position. Among them were probably included the nobles not having their residence at Vaiśālī or not enjoying sovereign authority for life. That the Licchavis as a whole formed an aristocratic class is proved by the appellation *khattiya* habitually applied to them in the Buddhist texts, as also by the Jaina *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* I. 13. 10, referring to their 'renowned *gotra*'. Besides the privileged order of nobles, there must have been other freemen such as priests, traders and farmers living in the Vesāli State. In the complete absence of any data about the relative numbers of the nobles and non-nobles as also of the different orders of nobles, it is obviously not possible to predicate of the assembly of permanent *rājans* that it was a "popular" body.

4 Compare Francis and Neil's translation:—"Tradition says that the Licchavis of the ruling family to the number of 7707 had their abode at Vesāli."

5 This is the view not only of Dr. R. C. Majumdar and Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, but also of Dr. Beni Prasad (*The State in Ancient India*, pp. 156-157), Dr. Narayan Chandra Bandyopadhyaya (*Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, I, p. 251), and Dr. Benoy Chandra Sen, (*op. cit.*, pp. 30-31).

6 Even if we are to attribute this to the mystic significance of the number 7, the question may still be asked why the figure was not fixed at 7777 instead of 7707.

Coming to the second portion of the *Jātaka* passage (I. 504) above quoted, it may be remarked that the reference to as many *rājans, uparājans* etc. is not corroborated by any other text. To base a definite conclusion (in this case, about the character of the Licchavi constitution) on the authority of a single late uncorroborated text seems to be opposed to all canons of history. If indeed each *rājan* of the Licchavi State had his own administrative machinery for his separate principality, the complete silence of the older canonical tradition about the same would be altogether inexplicable. Assuming the statement of the *Jātaka* passage to be based on fact, it may be asked whether it stands the test of probability. We may admit that in view of the equal numbers of *rājans, uparājans* etc. mentioned in this passage, it is natural to associate each individual *rājan* with his corresponding *uparājan* and so forth. It is, however, hard to undertsand how a cumbrous constitution of the kind sought to be found in the *Jātaka* text, which puts a premium upon disruptive tendencies, could work in actual practice.[7] The analogy of the Cleisthenian constitution seems to be hardly convincing. The ten Cleisthenic tribes consisting of inhabitants of different *demes* were groups of citizens scattered over the whole of Attica and their function was to elect the members of the probouleutic Council of Five Hundred, of the board of ten *strategi*, of the Board of ten *apodecti* and the like. On the other hand, according to the interpretation above suggested, the Licchavi *rājans* with their staff of *uparājans* etc. would all be resident at the capital, each forming admittedly "a State in miniature." Equally unwarranted is the analogy of the constitution of the late German empire. In this constitution the emperor was the head of the army and controlled a considerable portion of the imperial finance. Among the Licchavis on the other hand, according to the above supposition the constituent princes would have their separate armies and treasuries, while there would be no single ruler in charge of the federal army and finance. Again, the German princes, unlike the Licchavi princes (according to the above interpretation), ruled their States from their respective capitals.

From a general review of the whole subject, we are of opinion that the statement in *Jāt.* (I. 504) relating to the multiple *uparājans* etc. is not only unauthenticated by independent testimony, but is *prima facie* improbable. It is not impossible that the words *tattakā yeva uparājāno* etc., were

7 Cf. the pertinent remarks of Dr. B. C. Sen, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.

added by a later scribe who was misled by the epithet *rājāno* applied to the Licchavi kings into equipping each of them in the fashion of the familiar monarchic states with a staff of viceroy, general and treasurer.

We may consider in this connection a reference in the Sinhalese commentary tradition to a striking feature of the constitution of the Vajjis, the confederacy of clans of which the Licchavis were the most important element. According to an oft-quoted passage in Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* (*Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, II, 519, P.T.S. edition), a person brought under arrest for theft was arraigned by the Vajji *rājās* before the *vinicchayamahāmattas*. If the latter on enquiry found the man to be innocent, they discharged him; if otherwise they sent him up to the *vohārikas*. The *vohārikas* in case they found the accused guilty made him over to the *suttadhāras*, the *suttadhāras* in the similar case made him over to the *aṭṭhakulakas*, the *aṭṭhakulakas* in the similar case to the *senāpati*, the *senāpati* to the *uparājā*, and the *uparājā* to the *rājā*. The *rājā* released the accused if found innocent, otherwise he punished him in accordance with the *paveṇipotthaka* ('Book of Precedents'). Commenting on the above, K. P. Jayaswal (*Hindu Polity*, I, 52) says: "Liberty of the citizen was most jealously guarded. A citizen could not be held guilty unless, he was considered so by the senāpati, the uprājā, the rājā, separately and without dissent." More eloquent is the tribute of Dr. R. C. Majumdar who says (*op. cit.*, 95-96):—"The right of the individual was thus safeguarded in a manner that has had probably few parallels in the world. He could be punished only if seven successive tribunals had *unanimously* found him guilty, and he was quite safe if but one of them found him innocent."

The first difficulty in accepting the above interpretation lies in the lateness of the Sinhalese tradition which has come down to us only as preserved by Buddhaghosa some eight centuries after the fall of Vajji independence. Again, the very elaborate procedure described above, for which there seems to be no parallel elsewhere, is enough to raise suspicion about the genuineness of the whole account. In the *Jātaka* tales dealing with the monarchic State, the *vinicchayāmaccas* undoubtedly form the special staff in charge of judicial work, while the *senāpati* and the *uparājā* seem to be occasionally charged with this function over and above their usual duties. Finally, the king himself sits frequently as a court of first instance for the disposal of civil as well as criminal suits. Of the dispensation of criminal justice by the *vinicchayāmaccas* as well as a regular chain of courts from

these officers at the bottom to the king at the top there is no trace. In fact, the king appears to guard his jurisdiction over criminal cases as his special prerogative. A *vohārika*, otherwise called *vohārika-mahāmatta*, is doubtless known to the canonical texts. But the *aṭṭhakulakas* are equally unknown to the canonical and the Jātaka tradition. It is probable of course that the excessive centralisation of criminal justice in the king's hands in the monarchic States led to a strong reaction in the constitution of some of the republics. But to suppose that no one in the Vajji State could be convicted unless unanimously found guilty by seven succesive courts is to imply that the supreme authority in that State had little or no confidence in the judicial capacity or honesty of its own officers. In any case, a cumbrous procedure of the kind suggested above, providing ample loopholes for the escape of criminals from the hands of justice, would be attended with grave risk of abuse of liberty of the subject.

Summing up the above facts, we may state that the alleged judicial procedure of the Vajjis ensuring an unparalleled guarantee of the liberty of the subject rests on the statement of an authority dated nearly eight centuries after the event. Though that authority claims it to be the *Porāṇavajjidhamma*, it is not testified to by any earlier extant source. Again, it has to be admitted that the procedure, if based on fact, would itself be a serious reflection on the competence of the subordinate judiciary, while it would be attended with the positive danger of abuse of the principle it was supposed to guarantee. What then is the likely explanation of the statement of the famous commentator? It is not improbable that the later tradition piled up all the officers known to be associated at any time with judicial work and added other names to the list in an attempt to exalt the Vajji people and their government. It is also probable that the same tradition ascribed to the whole chain of these officers up to the *uparājan* what may have been true of some of them, viz., their duty of committing to the higher court a person found to be guilty, and that of releasing him forthwith, if he was proved innocent. In conclusion, we may mention, as an apt comment on the veracity of the late Jātaka and commentary tradition, that while it credits the admittedly unitary Licchavi State with numbers of *uparājans* and *senāpatis*, it attributes to the known federal constitution of the Vajjis a single one of these officers.

U. N. GHOSHAL

Influence of contemporary Sculpture on the Kannaḍa Poet Rudrabhaṭṭa

It is a well known fact that the distinguishing feature of the Hoysaḷa architecture is the richness of ornamentation and the enormously large variety of *motifs* employed in the sculptural decorations on the walls, pillars, towers and wherever space could be found, in temples of this style. The fabulous bird *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* (the mighty double-headed eagle) was a favourite bird with the sculptors of the Kannaḍa country; and fine specimens of the sculptural representation of this bird are found in many temples in the Hoysaḷa country. Students of South Indian History are familiar with the fact that the Hoysaḷas bore the title of *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* and possibly this mythical bird was one of their emblems.[1] That this bird was adopted as the insignia and *biruda* of this dynasty of rulers, as well as of many others in the Deccan,[2] is probably due to the fact that it is a symbol

1 *An. Rep. on S.I.E.* for 1937, p. 77 where is noted the existence of the figure of a *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* sculptured on each of the four door-jambs of the big *gopura* in the middle of the Kiḷchittirai-vidi at Śrīraṅgam.

2 The history of the double-headed eagle or *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* goes back to very early times. On this *motif* Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy has observed as follows:—"The two-headed bird which first appears in Hittite art at Boghazkoi then on a Jaina *stūpa* base at Taxila, later as a common Saracenic and European armorial device, and finally in Simhalese folk art." (*History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 12). The Taxila monument is attributed to the reign of the Scytho-Parthian king Azes II, i.e., about the 1st century A.D. The earliest example of *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* in South India is the one at the top of the *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa-stambha*, set up at Beḷagāmi, in the Mysore state, by the *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Cāmuṇḍarasa in Śaka 969 (A.D. 1047) though as a title *bheruṇḍa* is found to have been borne by a chief named Satyāśraya in an inscription of Śaka 953 (*Ep. Carn.*, vol. VII, Shikarpur 30). It may be noted, however, that the sculpture at Beḷagāmi "takes the form of a human being, standing upright with two birds' heads looking opposite ways like the Russian eagle. It is eating or tearing something which it holds in his hands." (Cousens, *Chalukyan Architecture*, p. 146). The Coḷa feudatory chief Tribhuvanamalla Mallideva-Coḷa is given the title *vairi-nṛpa-śarabha-bheruṇḍa* in an inscription of Śaka 1101 (*SII.*, vol. IX, No. 273). More than one Hoysaḷa king had the title *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* (see e.g. *Ep. Carn.* vol. V, Arasikere 178; *SII.*, vol. IX, No. 343; *SII.*, vol. VII, No. 213). Coming to the Vijayanagara dynasty we notice that *Rāya-gaja-gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* is the legend on the coins of *Devarāya* (*Ind. Ant.*, vol. XX. pp. 303-304), Kṛṣṇadevarāya had the title *gajaugha-gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* (*SII.*,

of extraordinary strength and ferocity. It is depicted in many places as carrying elephants and lions in its claws and beaks. According to popular tradition, at the time of the Narasiṃha (man-lion) incarnation of Viṣṇu the world was frightened and to allay the fear of men Śiva took the form of a *śarabha,* which is supposed to have eight feet and to be capable of subduing lions, whereupon Viṣṇu assumed the form of a *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* which is said to be stronger than the *śarabha* and its deadly enemy. Thus on account of its being associated with the royal insignia and on account of its incredible strength and form, which afforded the sculptor unlimited scope for the display of his imagination and skill, this fabulous bird must have been chosen as a favourite theme in the decoration of many temples

IV, p. 53) and *Aribha-gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* is a *biruda* of Acyutarāya (*EI.*, III, p. 154). On one of the gold coins of Acyuta is found the figure of a *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* holding elephants in its beaks and claws. (*Ind. Ant.*, vol. XX, p. 306; photograph on pl. ii). Some later chiefs are also known to have had the title *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa*. *Arirāya-gaja-gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* is a *biruda* of the *Sāḷuva* chief Sāḷuva-Malla of Nagara who flourished in the 16th century (*SII.*, vol. VII, No. 207). In the ceiling of the Vīrabhadra temple at Keḷadi (Mysore State) constructed by the Keḷadi chief Doḍḍa-Saṅkaṇṇa-Nāyaka (A.D. 1566) is carved a fine specimen of the figure of *gaṇḍa-bheruṇḍa* (*Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1928, pl. XI). Even at the present day the royal house of Mysore uses this as a *biruda* and the figure of the bird adorns the Mysore flag. In the Telugu country *gaṇḍabherunda* occurs as the *biruda* of the chief Rācūri Dāraparāja, whose wife made a grant in Śaka 1008 to the god Bhīmeśvara at Drākṣārāma (*SII.*, vol. IV, No. 1053). The Koṭa chiefs of Amarāvatī had the appellation *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* and the seal of the Eḍavalli plates of Keta III, of this family (Śaka 1162) bears in relief the figure of a *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa* (*Mad. Ep. Rep.*, 1916, part II, para 55). It was also borne by the Telugu Cōḍa chiefs Bhaktirāja and Annadeva (*Journal of Oriental Research*, vol. V, p. 139 and *SII.*, vol. V, No. 145). The Sāgi chief Gannama-Nāyaka is stated in an inscription of Śaka 1399 at Vinukoṇḍa in the Guntur Dist. of the Madras Presidency (No. 528 of 1913 of the Madras Epigraphical collection) to have had the title *gaṇḍabheruṇḍa*. Below this inscription is a fine figure of the fabulous mān-bird lifting up two elephants with his two hands.

It may not be out of place to add that the two-headed eagle is represented on the coins of Nasir-ud-din Mahmud (A.H. 597-619) and Rukn-ad-din Maudud (A.H. 619-29) of the dynasty of Urtukis of Kafya (*Coins of Urtuki Turkmans* by Lane Poole, pp. 20 ff.; pl. V, Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 7). On one of them (No. 3) the eagle appears with grotesque wings formed of bearded heads of men. Lane Poole observes:—"The origin of the two-headed eagle is very obscure. One thing alone is certain, that it was known in the East long before it was adopted by the emperor of Germany".

Chain of destruction panel
[Būcheśvara Temple at
Koramaṅgala]

of the Hoysaḷa period. In one single frieze the artist could depict the superiority in form and strength of one animal to another from the elephant up to *gaṇḍabherunḍa* showing the *gaṇḍabherunḍa* as the most powerful of the series so as to make the whole design beautiful and attractive. Such sculptural panels intended to give an idea of the incredible strength and formidableness of the *gaṇḍabherunḍa* are to be found at least in two Hoysaḷa structures namely, the Keśava temple at Belūr and the Būcheśvara temple at Koramaṅgala, both in the Mysore state, the home country of the Hoysaḷas. These sculptures have been called 'the chain of destruction' by the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Rao Bahadur R. Narasimhacharya, who has described them fully. The following description of the sculpture in the Belūr temple which was built by the Hoysala king Viṣṇuvardhana in A.D. 1117 is given in his monograph on the Keśava temple at Belūr:[3] "To the right of the north-east ugly structure enshrining Raṅganātha, a chain of destruction—a double-headed eagle or *gaṇḍabherunḍa* attacking a *śarabha,* which attacks a lion, which in its turn attacks an elephant, the latter seizing a snake, which is in the act of swallowing a rat—with the figure of a sage wondering at the sight." The same scholar has described almost in the same words a similar sculpture on one of the walls of the shrine of Sūrya in the Būcheśvara temple at Koramaṅgala which was consecrated by Būchirāja on the day of the coronation of the Hoysaḷa king Ballāḷa II in A.D. 1173:—"A chain of destruction—a double-headed eagle or *gaṇḍabherunḍa* attacking a *śarabha,* which attacks a lion, which in its turn attacks an elephant, the latter seizing with its trunk a huge serpent which is in the act of swallowing an antelope—with the figure of a sage wondering at the sight"[4] (see the accompanying plate).

This sculptural *motif,* in spite of its not being natural, appears to have been so highly popular with, and evoked the admiration of the cultured classes of the 12th century that the Kannaḍa poet Rudrabhaṭṭa thought it appropriate to give a graphic account of it in his work *Jagannāthavijaya.* There are reasons to believe that this work was composed in about A.D. 1180, during the reign of the Hoysaḷa king Vīra-Ballāḷa II who ruled from A.D. 1173 to 1220.[5] While expatiating on the grandeur of the wild forest

3 Page 8.

4 *Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1920, pp. 4-5.

5 R. Narasimhacharya, *Karṇāṭaka-Kavi-charite,* vol. I (revised), p. 270.

on the slopes of the Raivata mountain, Rudrabhaṭṭa has recorded his appreciation of this artistic design in vivid language in the following verse:—[6]

"Mare-dind = ā sarpanaṃ hastiyẹ piḍiduduv = ā sarpanaṃ hastiyaṃ kesari kop-āṭopadiṃ poyd = ugibagiduduv = ā sarpanaṃ hastiyaṃ kesariyaṃ siṃhāriy = eṇṭum padadin = iṛidud = ā sarpanaṃ hastiyaṃ kesariyaṃ siṃhāriyaṃ tuṃḍadoḷe piḍidu pāṛittu bheruṃḍan = āgaḷ" ||

It may be translated thus:—

"The elephant caught the serpent which had eaten the deer; the lion struck and tore asunder that serpent and that elephant, with furious rage; the lion's enemy (i.e., *śarabha*) seized and pierced with its eight feet that serpent, that elephant and that lion; and then the *bheruṇḍa* caught hold of that serpent, that elephant, that lion and that lion's enemy in its beak and flew away."

How exactly the Koramaṅgala panel mentioned above answers to the description of the imagery in this verse from *Jagannāthavijaya* will be clear by observing the photograph of the panel reproduced on the plate accompanying this article. We may take it, therefore, that the poet Rudrabhaṭṭa was apparently inspired by the sculptural representations of this imaginary scene which must have been displayed prominently on several structures of his day and arrested his attention frequetnly.

N. Lakshminarayan Rao

6 *Jagannāthavijaya* (ed. Mysore Oriental Library), *āśvāsa* 16, v. 14.

MISCELLANY

A forged Purāṇa-text on the Imperial Guptas

In the Introduction to his *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature,* published in 1937, Mr. Krishnamachariar sought to prove that Sandracottus, referred to by the Greek historians, was not Candragupta Maurya, but a king of the Imperial Gupta dynasty. In support of his contention he quoted a passage from *Kaliyuga-vṛttānta,* which, we are told, forms a part of the *Bhaviṣyottara-Purāṇa.*[1] No notice was taken of this passage by other scholars until, quite recently, Dr. B. Bhattacharya, in the last issue of the *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*[2] pointed out that although the proposed indentification of Mr. Krishnamachariar was untenable, the passage contained a true account of the history of the Imperial Guptas. Dr. Bhattacharya has strongly denounced the writers of Gupta history, like late R. D. Banerjee, Dr. H. C. Raichaudhuri, and Dr. R. G. Basak who, in imitation of their European *gurus, merely* relied on coins and inscriptions for the reconstruction of the Gupta history and did not consult the Purāṇas as that would constitute a *guru-droha* (disobedience of *guru*). In righteous indignation, Dr. Bhattacharya points out that all the problems of the Gupta history, which have so long perplexed the scholars, would have been easily solved if the scholars had spent, on the study of the Purāṇas, one hundredth part of the time and energy they wasted on coins and inscriptions. Such cheap jibes at eminent scholars are quite unbecoming, even if Dr. Bhattacharya's claims prove to be true. But before we proceed to discuss this question, it would be convenient to give a short summary of the passage in question, changing the future tense in which the events are described, in the fashion of other Purāṇas, into past tense:

"Candraśrī Śātakarṇī, known also as the son of Vāsiṣtha, enjoyed the kingdom for 3 years. After him yet another Pulomā ruled for seven years under the protection of Candra-gupta, son of Ghaṭotkaca. These 32 Andhra kings ruled the earth for 500 years. While they were yet on the

1 Pp. cii-civ. The author does not say anything about the *Ms.* consulted by him but simply puts at the end of the quotation "*Bhāga* III, Chap. III."

2 Vol. XXX, pp. 1 ff.

throne[3] the country passed to the Guptas who were known as the Śrī-parvatīya Andhrabhṛtya kings.

"Candra-gupta, born in the family of the Parvatīyas, was the grandson of king Gupta, lord of Śrī-Parvata, and son of Śrī-Ghaṭotkaca. He married Kumāradevī, the daughter of the king of Nepal. With the help of the Licchavis he gained influence in the kingdom (of the Andhras) and became the commander-in-chief.

"Candra-gupta married[4] a Licchavi girl who was the younger sister of the queen of Candraśrī, and he became thus the brother-in-law of the king (*rāṣṭrīya-śyālaka*). Being instigated by the queen he killed Candraśrī and was appointed by the queen-regent in place of her son.[5] Seven years later Candra-gupta ascended the throne after killing Pulomā. Having thus forcibly seized the kingdom of Magadha from the Andhras he ruled conjointly with his son Kāca, born of his Licchavi wife. He assumed the title Vijayāditya, established an era (*Śākam*) and reigned for seven years.

"His son of the Nepal princess, killed his father with sons and relatives with the help of *mleccha* soldiers, took the title Aśokāditya, and became a *rāja-cakravartī* or universal sovereign. He conquered the whole earth and performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice. He was highly honoured by kings, both of his own and foreign countries, and was well versed in *śāstras*, literature and music and was eulogised by poets. He ruled for 51 years.

"His son Candra-gupta drove away the Yavanas and Hūnas from the country. Like Vikramāditya he was constantly surrounded by learned men and was himself versed in *Śruti, Smṛti, Purāṇa, Itihāsa* and *Kāvya*. He was famous in the world by his title Vikramāditya. He crossed the seven Sindhus and conquered the Vāhlikas and other tribes, planted pillars of fame up to the Surāṣṭra country and reigned for thirty-six years.

3 This is the translation of the phrase '*teṣām tu saṁsthite rājye*' by Krishnamachariar (*op. cit.*). But this very expression is used also in connection with the Andhras in *Matsya, Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* Purāṇas, and Pargiter translates it "when the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end." (*Dynasties of the Kali age*, pp. 45, 72). Pargiter's translation is preferable.

4 Dr. Bhattacharya adds the word 'next' before 'married', which would mean that Candra-gupta married a second time, but there is no authority for this in the text.

5 This is Dr. Bhattacharya's translation. The original expression—*tat-putra-pratibhūtve*—probably means that he was appointed regent during her son's minority.

"His son, born of Dhruvadevī, was Kumāra-gupta, who performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice, bore the title of Mahendrāditya and reigned for forty-two years.

"His son Skanda-gupta humbled the pride of the Hūnas and destroyed Puṣyasena. He took the title Parākramāditya and reigned for twenty-five years.

Next ruled Narasiṃha-gupta, known as Bālāditya, son of Sthira-gupta Prakāśāditya. Nara was appointed king by his uncle Skanda-gupta during his life-time, and ruled along with his father for forty years.

Narasiṃha's son Kumāra-gupta II was famous as Kramāditya after his war with the Hūnas. He defeated Īśānavarman and others, was loyally served by Bhaṭṭārka and ruled for forty-four years.

"These Gupta kings who used the imperial titles Mahārājādhirāja *etc.* ruled for 245 years."

Any one who reads the passage will be struck with the fullness of details, and the very close agreement of many of them with the data furnished by the coins and inscriptions of the Guptas, such as we do not find in the Purāṇas with regard to any other dynasty. This very fact ought to make us very cautious about the genuineness of the text as an old and authentic Purāṇa. But Dr. Bhattacharya has not considered this aspect of the question, and unhesitatingly accepted the account as true, even when it differs from contemporary records. For example, he regards Samudra-gupta as a parricide although we learn from the Allahabad Pillar Ins. that he was selected king by his father. Many manuscripts of the *Bhaviṣyottara-Purāṇa* are known and some of these contain sections dealing with 'future kings' or 'kings of Kali age.'[6] It does not appear that Dr. Bhattacharya took the trouble to find out if these agreed in any way with the account on which he so implicitly relied, though such a comparison is essential in arriving at a decision about the genuineness of this work.

If we now examine the contents, we find in the first place how the passage radically differs from such authentic *Purāṇas* as *Vāyu, Matsya*, etc. These *Purāṇas* also mention Śrī-Parvatīya Andhras, but regard them as

6 M. A. Stein's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Raghunatha Temple Library of His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir* (p. 208) refers to *'Bhavisyottarapurāṇe Bhāvirājanirūpaṇam'*, Kielhorn also refers to 'Kali-rājavarṇana, from the *Bhavisya-purāṇa*' on p. 83 of his *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1880-81*.

quite distinct from the Guptas. Dr. Bhattacharya, in his article, has omitted all reference to that part of the passage in which the Guptas are identified with the Śrī-Parvatīya Andhra-bhṛtyas. His account begins with the verse referring to Candra-gupta. But there also Gupta is mentioned as lord of Śrī-Parvata, and belonging to the family of the Parvatīyas. Without any reference to the preceding verses which distinctly state that the Guptas were known as the Śrī-Parvatīya Andhrabhṛtya kings he holds that the Guptas were descended from a hill-tribe, and locates Śrī-Parvata, their original kingdom, near the Himalayas. But Śrī-Parvata is mentioned in the *Purāṇas* and is the name of a lofty rock which overhangs the river Krishna. The *Agni Purāṇa* mentions Śrī-Parvata on the river Kaveri, but its situation in the Andhra country makes the former identification more likely, so far as the home of the Andhrabhṛtyas is concerned.[7]

Next it would appear from the passage that the Andhra kings ruled only over Magadha, and Candra-gupta I usurped that kingdom by killing the last Andhra king. Nothing is said about the Deccan which according to all reliable evidence formed the home province of the Andhras. If the passage implies that Candra-gupta's dominions included these as well, it would be against the testimony of all authentic Purāṇas which describe the Gupta dominions as comprising only the territories along the Ganges.

The historical back-ground of the *Kaliyuga-Vṛttānta* is thus radically opposed to the testimony of all the older *Purāṇas*. As to the history of the Guptas themselves it is surprising how the author shows very accurate knowledge regarding the reign-periods of some kings and their *Āditya* titles which were known from coins and inscriptions long ago, but shows lamentable ignorance in respect of similar details about others which have come to light in comparatively recent times. Thus Skanda-gupta is said to have ruled for twenty-five years, a view held by scholars until the discovery of the inscription of Kumāra-gupta dated 473-4 A.D. Again there is no reference to Budha-gupta, who was not regarded by the scholars as belonging to the imperial Gupta dynasty until the discovery of the Damodarpur copper-plates. The Nālandā seals, recently discovered, prove that Budhagupta was a son of Pūru-gupta, and we know that he ruled for nearly a quarter of a century. Yet the *Kaliyuga-Vṛttānta* knows nothing of him,

7 For the location of Śrī-Parvata cf. *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* Tr. by Pargiter, p. 290.

It makes Bhaṭṭārka a general of Kumāra-Gupta II whose reign-period, according to the details supplied, cannot be earlier than 522 A.D., and yet Bhaṭṭārka must have died long before 502 A.D. when the second king after him was ruling Valabhi.

The passage seeks to solve two controversial matters which have been agitating the historians for a long time, viz. the identity of Kāca and king Candra of the Meharauli Pillar Ins. It even describes, almost in the language of this inscription, how king Candra-gupta II 'crossed the seven Sindhus and conquered the Vāhlikas.'

Dr. Bhattacharya also exultingly points out how the reign-period of seven years assigned to Candra-gupta I fits in with the genuineness of the Gayā Copper-plate of Samudra-gupta dated year 9. Unfortunately he overlooks a similar copper-plate of the same king that has recently been discovered at Nālandā and is dated year 5.[8] This does not fit in with the seven years' rule of Candra-gupta I after he founded the Gupta era as assumed by Dr. Bhattacharya.

The very intimate acquaintance with certain facts and problems known long ago from coins and inscriptions, and the complete ignorance of others which have recently come to light, raise a very strong presumption that this passage of *Kaliyuga-Vṛttānta* is a modern forgery. Fortunately this presumption is definitely proved to be correct by its mention of Sthira-gupta Prakāśāditya as the father of Narasiṃha-gupta Bālāditya. Now every student of Gupta history knows that the father of Narasiṃha-gupta is named Pūru-gupta, and there is no king called Sthira-gupta in the imperial Gupta dynasty. What is not, however, so generally known is that when the Bhitari Seal was discovered, revealing for the first time the names of Pūru-gupta and his successors, there was a difference of opinion about the reading of this name. Dr. Hoernle read it as Pura-gupta in *JASB*, 1889, (Part I, p. 89) and Fleet agreed with him (*IA*. 1899, p. 226). But in his article on the Gupta coinage published in *JRAS*, 1893 (p. 83), V. A. Smith observed that according to Dr. Bühler, "the correct reading was Sthira-gupta, and Sir A. Cunningham was inclined to accept this reading." Later (*ibid*., p. 127) Smith says that 'the reading Pura is certainly untenable' and that Mr. Rapson agreed with Dr. Bühler and Sir A. Cunningham that the word is "certainly not *Pura*" and may be

8 *EI*., XXV. 50.

'*Sthira*'. Smith reiterates his view in *JASB*. 1894 (Part I, p. 166) and informs us that "Dr. Führer, in his label on the seal of Kumāra-gupta II, in the Lucknow Museum, definitely adopts the reading '*Sthira*'. Later, in the same journal (p. 210) Hoernle supports the reading *Pura* and points out that Cunningham read the name as Puru-gupta in his 'coins of Mediaeval India'. Subsequently the reading Pura-gupta was 'generally adopted, and Smith accepted this form of the name in his *Early History of India* (published in 1904). The recently discovered Nālandā Seals show that the name is really Pūru-gupta, as suggested by Cunningham. So far about the name Sthira-gupta. As regards his title Prakāśāditya, Hoernle was the first to suggest in *JASB.*, 1889 (Part I, p. 93) that this title probably belonged to Pura-Gupta. Other scholars have accepted this suggestion as reasonable, though definite evidence is lacking, but Allan regarded it as highly improbable in his *Catalogue of Gupta Coins* published in 1914.

The occurrence of the name of Sthira-gupta in *Kaliyuga-Vṛttānta* leaves no doubt that it is a modern forgery, and the person who composed it was familiar with the writings of the scholars named above, who adopted this erroneous form due to the wrong reading of the Bhitari seal: for it would be nothing short of a miracle if a genuine text composed before 1890 A.D. would contain exactly the same mistaken form of the name as was erroneously adopted by some modern scholars. The dates given above for each publication show that the erroneous form was current for about a period of ten years between 1893 and 1903, and we can reasonably fix the date of the forgery within this brief interval. The forger adopted the form of the name, backed by such high authorities as Rapson, Bühler, Cunningham, and V. A. Smith, and also the theory current at the time that Prakāśāditya was the title of the king. Fortunately his adoption of the wrong form has given us positive evidence about his forgery, for it would otherwise have formed a subject of interminable discussion. But this example should be a warning to scholars that before accepting any new literary text as historical evidence, they should carefully examine its authenticity.

R. C. Majumdar

The Kāca Problem

Sometime ago I hastened to write a note in Bengali in the *Śrī-bhāratī*[1] on the apocryphal character of the chapter on the Guptas in the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛttānta* of the *Bhaviṣy-ottara Purāṇa* as incorporated in the introduction to the *History of the Classical Literature* by Dr. M. Krishnamachariar (Madras, 1937), and on which Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya has written, without any misgiving in mind, a lengthy paper in *JBRS.*, 1944, March, pp. 1-40. Although all my efforts to obtain for collation a MS. of the *Bhaviṣy-ottara Purāṇa* including the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛttānta* section have failed, neither have I said in that note nor do I profess it even now that the entire chapter relating to the Guptas in the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛttānta* is a spurious one. But the stamp that several verses in the chapter as we have it in Dr. Krishnamachariar's book bear of fabrication is too patent to any serious student of history and should have readily struck a scholar of Dr. Bhattacharyya's standing. It remains, however, unknown if the very MS. used by Dr. Krishnamachariar or its immediate model copy has suffered those interpolations, but they seem to have been the work of an interested hand operating sometime in the latter half of the 19th century.

The story of the Guptas in the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛttānta* begins by saying that "while they (the Andhra kings) are yet on the throne, the country will pass to the Guptas who will be known as the Śrīpārvatīya Andhrabhṛtya kings (i.e. "those that had come from Śrīparvata and had been in the service of the Andhras"). (Dr. Krishnamachariar's translation). The Śrīpārvatīya Andhrabhṛtyāḥ of the *Matsya Purāṇa*[2] have been taken[3] though not beyond doubt, to represent the Southern Ikṣvākus of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Jaggayapeta inscriptions, and in any case the Śrīparvata in question must have been the Śrīparvata which is now a familiar name to us from the Nāgārjuni-koṇḍa records and which is to be identified either with a lofty hill on the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa site overlooking the Kṛṣṇā at the northern end of the plateau or with the whole range of the Nallamalai hills.[4] This is the Śrīparvata, it may be added here, which is mentioned also in the *Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*:—

1 Bhādra-Āśvina, 1351 B.S., pp. 7-8.

2 Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 44 and 46.

3 Cf. K. Gopalachari, *Early History of the Andhra Country*, University of Madras, 1941, p. 125.

4 Gopalachari, *op. cit.*, foot-note 8.

श्रीपर्वते महाशैले दक्षिणापथ संज्ञिके
श्रीधान्यकटके चैत्ये जिनधातु-धरे भुवि ।[5]

The *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛttānta* not only speaks of the Guptas as Andhrabhṛtyas in a general sense but also makes Candragupta I as to have actually served the Andhra king, Candraśrī, as his commander-in-chief. The whole context of the Purāṇa bears out so clear and strong an association of the early Guptas with Andhras that it renders Dr. Bhattacharyya's supposition that the Śrīparvata under notice was "somewhere in the Himalayan regions adjacent to the Nepal country"[6] absolutely wide of the mark and perhaps underserving of consideration. And therewith thus gives way the structure on which he rested his speculation that because of their being a hillman tribe like the Mongols, lax were the ideas of morality and decency of the Guptas who never cared for the orthodox injunctions and prohibitions and indulged in polyandry as also in beliefs in ghosts and goblins.

The Purāṇic story, which is of course anything but history, then goes on to say that the commander-in-chief, Candragupta, who had already gained immense influence in Candraśrī's kingdom, married a Licchavi girl, the younger sister of the Andhra queen and having thus been the brother-in-law of the king, he at the instigation of Candraśrī's own queen killed the king. Evidently the murder of the king followed soon after Candragupta's marrying the queen's sister. Puloman, the minor son of the queen, was, again, put to death after seven years by the regent Candragupta, who then forcibly captured the kingdom of Magadha from the Andhras, and began to rule there conjointly with his son, Kaca, born of the Licchavi wife. Kaca was thus at best seven or eight years old when he sat with his father on Magadhan throne. After another seven years, i.e. when the age of Kaca was 14 or 15, he is said to have been slain, along with his father and other relatives, by his half-brother, Samudragupta.

And we are wanted by one more scholar[7] to believe that this Kaca of the Purāṇa, quite a minor lad, is the *Sarvarājocchetta Kāca* of the coins. When Prof. Altekar says that "It is however not unlikely that in spite of mistake of these doubtful traditions, the statement that Kāca was another

5 Ed. Ganapati Sastri, 10th *Paṭala*, p. 88.
6 *JBRS.*, XXX, p. 6..
7 *JBRS.*, XXX, p. 13; *Jour. Numi. Soc. of India*, vol. V, pp. 33-36, 149-150.

son of Candragupta may be true",[8] it is also a tacit assumption of the probability of the coins being issued by the youngster! It is no use raising here the question of how much we lose of history by reposing confidence in the tale of a Licchavi-dauhitra ruling jointly with his father of Andhra (Śrīparvata) descent to be assassinated by Samudragupta, the Hindu Aurangzīb, but let me only say that the Kāca problem stands to-day exactly where it stood before the publication of Dr. Bhattacharyya's interesting but not illuminating paper.

NALINI NATH DAS GUPTA

A Note on Vajraṭa

In the last number of this Journal,[1] Dr. N. Venkataramanayya has discussed the identification of Vajraṭa who, together with the great emperor Harṣa and some princes of the South, is mentioned in several Rāṣṭrakūṭa records as defeated by Karṇāṭa (i.e., Cālukya) forces. Dr. Venkataramanayya rightly points out that this Vajraṭa must have been a king of the north. He identifies him with the lord of the entire Uttarāpatha (North India) who was defeated in *circa* A.D. 674 by the Cālukya princes Vinayāditya and his son Vijayāditya and divested of the *Pālidhvaja* and other insignia of paramountcy. Further, he thinks that this Vajraṭa is identical with Vajrāyudha mentioned by Rājaśekhara as a king of Pañcāla with his capital at Kanauj and that he may be the same as the famous 'Va', the emperor of all India, described in the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*.

Dr. Venkataramanayya does not appear to have noticed the Nasik plates of Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha edited by Mr. G. H. Khare. These plates mention that Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha, a son of Pulakeśin II, defeated and exterminated the whole army of Vajjaḍa with a multitude of bright-tipped arrows in the country between the Mahī and the Narmadā.[2] Mr. Khare has already shown that this Vajjaḍa must be identical with Vajraṭa mentioned in several Rāṣṭrakūṭa records as defeated by the forces of the Cālukyas. These plates contain a date which, however, was not noticed

8 *Jour. Numi. Soc. of India,* vol. V, p. 36, fn. 1.

1 *IHQ.*, vol. XX, pp. 181 ff.

2 See lines 9-13 महीनर्म्मदान्तराल(ले) धवलफलशिलीमुखजालविजितविनिहतवज्जडसमस्तसैन्या(न्यः)...... धराश्रयश्रीजयसिंहवर्मराजः । *Sources of the Mediaeval History of the Deccan* (Marathi), vol. I, pp. 8 ff.

by Mr. Khare. I read it previously[3] as *saṃ 400 10 6 Cai śu 10 5, i.e.*, the fifteenth *tithi* of the bright fortnight of Caitra in the year 416, but subsequent study has convinced me that the second numerical symbol[4] of the year denotes 30, not 10. The date is thus the fifteenth *tithi* of the bright fortnight of Caitra in the year 436. As Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha, who was a son of Pulakeśin II, flourished in the seventh century A.D., this date must be referred to the Kalacuri era which was current in northern Mahārāṣṭra till A.D. 710 at least.[5] The date does not admit of verification as no week-day or *nakṣatra* has been mentioned, but the statement in the body of the grant, *viz.*, that it was made on the occasion of the *viṣuva* or Meśa-saṅkrānti on the tenth *tithi* of the bright fortnight of Caitra, affords some basis for calculation. In the current Kalacuri year 436, the vernal equinox occurred on the 20th March A.D. 685, a few hours before the commencement of the *tithi* Caitra śu. di. 10. The Saṅkrānti did not of course occur during the *tithi* of the date, but such slight descrepancies in regard to the moment of the saṅkrānti are not infrequently met with.[6] Besides, the auspicious time of the Meśa-saṅkrānti extends to as many as forty *ghaṭikās* before and after the saṅkrānti.[7] It would therefore seem that the gift was made either in the evening of the 20th March A.D. 685, or in the morning of the next day, when the 10th *tithi* of Caitra was current.

The Nasik plates state that the battle in which Vajjaḍa was defeated was fought in the country between the Mahī and the Narmadā. This country was under the ruler of a Gurjara family which, the Aihoḷe inscription[8] tells us, had submitted to Pulakeśin II. It seems therefore that when Vajjaḍa invaded the territory of the Gurjaras, the latter invoked the aid of their liege-lord, the Cālukya emperor of Bādāmi. The country to the South of the province of the Gurjaras was previously under the Sendra-

3 *D. R. Bhandarkar Volume*, pp. 53 ff.

4 Its form is exactly like that on some Kṣatrapa coins found at Sarvāṇiā. See, *e.g.*, the first and fifth symbols for 30 in Pl. LXVI, *An. Rep. ASI.*, for 1913-14.

5 The Añjaneri plates of Bhogaśakti, recently found in the Nāsik District, are dated in K.E. 461 (A.D. 710-11). *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XXV, pp. 225 ff.

6 See, *e.g.*, the similar case of the date of the Bijapur stone inscription of Someśvara II, *Ind. Ant.*, vol. XXIII, pp. 115 ff.

7 Compare त्रिंशत्कर्कटके नाड्यो मकरे तु दशाधिकाः । Cited by Hemādri from the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa.* See *Nirṇayasindhu* (Nirṇayasāgara Press ed.), p. 160.

8 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. VIII, pp. 1 ff.

kas who also were feudatories of the Cālukyas. The last date of the Sendrakas from Gujarat is K.E. 406 (A.D. 655-56), furnished by the Bagumra plates of Allaśakti.[9] Within fifteen years from this date we find the Sendrakas supplanted by Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha; for the next date from southern Gujarat is K.E. 421 (A.D. 670-71) of the Navasāari plates[10] of the Yuvarāja Śryāśraya Śilāditya, the son of Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha. Jayasiṃha was thus ruling over southern Gujarat when Vajjaḍa invaded the Gurjara territory. He seems to have been ordered by the Cālukya emperor to proceed to the north to drive the enemy out of the Gurjara province. The Nasik plates show that Jayasiṃha did this successfully and completely exterminated the army of Vajjaḍa. This event must have happened some time before K.E. 436 (A.D. 683), the date of the Nasik plates of Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha.

Dr. Venkataramanayya identifies this Vajraṭa with the lord of the whole Uttarāpatha who was defeated by Vinayāditya and despoiled of the *Pālidhvaja* and all other imperial insignia. As Vijayāditya, the son of Vinayāditya, is also credited with a similar exploit of the capture of the *Pālidhvaja* etc., Dr. Venkataramanayya rightly concludes that there was only one expedition to the north in which Vinayāditya actually captured the *Pālidhvaja,* acting under the command of his father. He thinks, however, that the expedition took place not during the reign of Vinayāditya, but during that of Vikramāditya I; for in the passage describing this event there occurs in the beginning the locative absolute *dakshiṇ-āśā-vijayini pitāmahe* which shows that Vijayāditya's grandfather, Vikramāditya I was then reigning and was engaged in conquering the southern country. He places the defeat of Vajraṭa in A.D. 674, which he says is the date of Vikramāditya's conquest of the southern region. There are some difficulties in accepting this view. Firstly, if such an important victory had been attained during the reign of Vikramāditya I, it would have surely found mention in that king's subsequent copper-plate charters. As a matter of fact, we find it mentioned neither in the grants of Vikramāditya I nor in those of his son Vinayāditya.[11] It is noticed for the first time in the records of Vijayāditya, the earliest of which so far discovered is the

9 *Ind. Ant.*, vol. XVIII, pp. 265 ff.

10 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. VIII, pp. 229 ff.

11 Even the Harihara plates of Vinayāditya issued as late as S.E. 616 do not mention it. *Ind. Ant.*, vol. VII, pp. 300 ff.

Nerur grant[12] dated Ś.E. 622 (A.D. 700). Secondly, if credit for this victory was given to Vinayāditya because his son was acting under his command, there is no reason why it should not have been given to the then reigning emperor Vikramāditya I who must have asked both his son and grandson to march to the north. It would therefore seem that this victory was attained towards the close of Vinayāditya's reign. The locative absolute *dakshiṇ-āśā-vijayini pitāmahe* which occurs in the Nerur plates is to be connected not with all the expressions that follow, but with only the immediately succeeding one, *viz.*, *samunmūlita-nikhila-kaṇṭaka-saṃhatiḥ.* Vijayāditya who must have been in his teens[13] at the time, did not actually take the field during his granfather's southren *digvijaya.* He was evidently kept at home to maintain peace and order in the Cālukyan kingdom which he did successfully and quelled all internal disorders. Towards the end of his father's reign in *circa* A.D. 695, he accompanied his father in his expedition to the north, fought bravely in his presence[14] defeated the emperor of North India and captured his *Pālidhvaja* and other insignia of imperial power which he made over to his father. The description in the Nerur and other plates clearly indicates that it was during this expedition and not during his grandfather's war with the Pallavas that he was taken captive by the retreating enemy. When he effected his escape, he found that there was anarchy in the kingdom, evidently because of his father's death which had occurred in the meanwhile. If the incident had occurred during the reign of Vikramāditya I or his son Vinayāditya, the drafter of the record would not have used in that passage the expression *arājakam* which signifies not merely a state of disorder, but the absence of all ruling power.

Jayasiṃha's victory over Vajraṭa was thus different from that of Vijayāditya over the emperor of North India. The former took place some time before A.D. 670, while the latter was probably not attained till A.D. 695.[15]

12 *Ibid.*, vol. IX, pp. 125 ff.

13 As Vijayāditya was ruling till A.D. 737, he must have been at most a youth of 16 or 18 in A.D. 674 when his grand-father made the southern conquests.

14 The expression *guror=agrata ev=āhava-vyāpāram-ācaran* was wrongly taken by Dr. Fleet to mean that Vijayāditya pushed further to the north even than his father. (*Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 371). The correct interpretation is as given above.

15 As. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar pointed out long ago, this expedition is not

In the former the Cālukyas were completely victorious; for Jayasiṃha is said to have totally exterminated all the forces of Vajraṭa. In the latter also, the Cālukya emperor gained a decisive victory and captured valuable booty, but he was not quite happy as his son was taken captive by the retreating enemy. It is thus clear that the two expeditions were not identical.

Dr. Venkataramanayya has suggested that this Vajraṭa is identical with Vajrāyudha who according to a statement of Rājaśekhara, ruled at Kanauj. Both Vajraṭa and Vajrāyudha are Sanskrit names. It is therefore inexplicable why Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions invariably name the king as Vajraṭa and not even once as Vajrāyudha. The Nasik plates of Jayasiṃha, which are a contemporary record, give the name as Vajjaḍa which also appears to be a Prakrit form of Vajraṭa, not of Vajrāyudha.[16] I am therefore inclined to take Vajraṭa as the correct Sanskrit name of the king defeated by Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha. Vajraṭa was plainly a northern king, since he invaded the country between the Mahī and the Narmadā. But the Nasik plates do not state where he was ruling. From a copper-plate inscription recently published by Mr. A. S. Garde,[17] it seems that Śilāditya III of Valabhī occupied the Gurjara country for some time during this very period; for the inscription records the grant of a field in the village Antikā in the *viṣaya* of Bharukaccha (modern Broach) which Śilāditya III made to a Brāhmaṇa who had emigrated from Girinagara and was then residing at Śraddhikā, modern Sādhi about 5 miles south by west of Pādrā in the Baroda State. The grant is dated G.E. 357 (A.D. 676-77), *i.e.*, only about nine years before Jayasiṃha's Nasik grant which records his victory over Vajjaḍa. Now Bharukaccha was not only included in the country of the Gurjaras, but was their capital in this period.[18] When a foreign ruler makes a grant in this district, it clearly indicates that the Gurjaras had lost their hold over that territory. The dates of the Gurja-

mentioned in the grant which Vinayāditya made in Śaka 616 (A.D. 694-95). *Early History of the Deccan, Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. ii.

16 The Prakrit form of Vajrāyudha is *Vajjāüdha* as given in the *Karpūra-mañjarī*, Act III, 5.

17 *Important Inscriptions from the Baroda State*, vol. I, pp. 18 ff.

18 The earlier Gurjara capital was Nāndipurī, modern Nāndoḍ, the capital of the Rājpiplā State, but later on, it was shifted to Broach. The Añjaneri plates of Jayabhaṭa III, were issued from Bharukaccha. No word like *vāsakāt* is added to this place-name. *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XXV, p. 293.

jara kings also suggest that they had suffered heavy reverses in this period. Between K.E. 392 (A.D. 642) the last known date of Dadda II-Praśāntarāga and K.E. 456 (A.D. 706) the next known date of his great-grandson Jayabhaṭa III, there is a gap of 64 years. Two Gurjara kings flourished in this period, but they have left us no records. These were troublous times for the Gurjaras; for their country was invaded and occupied twice by the Maitrakas of Valabhī, their powerful neighbours on the West. Dharasena IV who assumed the imperial titles *Parmabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Parameśvara* and *Cakravartin* is known to have issued two grants of land from his victorious camp at Bharukaccha in G.E. 330 (A.D. 649-50).[19] The villages granted lay however in the Kheṭaka-viṣaya (modern Kaira District) which was outside the Gurjara kingdom. It has therefore been supposed that Dharasena IV was enjoying the hospitality of the Gurjara king. This view does not however appear to be correct; for though in ancient times kings sometimes made grants of land situated in the territory which they had recently conquered, they did not do so invariably especially when the country was only raided and not permanently occupied.[20] Again, the adjective 'victorious' prefixed to Dharasena's camp in these grants indicates that he had gone to Bharukaccha in the course of a military campaign. He seems to have soon retired to his country, probably after exacting a heavy tribute from Jayabhaṭa II.

The second invasion occurred during the reign of Jayabhaṭa II's successor, Dadda III (*circa* A.D. 665-690). The contemporary king of Valabhī, Śīlāditya III, was like, Dharasena IV, a powerful ruler; for he also assumed the titles *Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja* and *Parameśvara*. He seems to have invaded the Gurjara kingdom and occupied at least the territory round Broach for some time as is indicated by his aforementioned grant of G.E. 357 (A.D. 676-677). Dadda III-Bāhusahāya then sought the aid of the Cālukya emperor by whose order Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha, who was ruling over the adjoining territory to the south, proceeded to the north and drove the enemy out of the Gurjara province. In the Navsāri plates of his son, Jayabhaṭa III, Dadda III is said to have obtained his well-known

19 *Ind. Ant.*, vols. VII, pp. 77 ff. and XV, pp. 339 ff.

20 As instances we may point out that the Vaḍner plates of Buddharāja though issued from his victorious camp at Vidiśā in Eastern Malwa record the grant of a village in the Nasik District, and the Karhāḍ plates of Kṛṣṇa III, though issued from his victorious camp at Melpāṭi in the North Arcot District, record the grant of a village near Karhāḍ in the Sātārā District of the Bombay Presidency.

second name Bāhusahāya (one whose arm is the sole helper) by the valour of his arm which he exhibited by routing numerous hosts of elephants that surrounded thousands of kings in the great war fought with the emperors (*adhirājas*) of the East and the West. The emperor of the West was evidently Śīlāditya III. It is noteworthy that the Navsāri plates of Jayabhaṭa III record his grant of land to a Brāhmaṇa who also, like the donee of Śīlāditya III's grant,[21] had emigrated from Girinagara and was then residing at the same village Śraddhikā. This clearly shows that the Gurjaras had recovered possession of the Bharukaccha-viṣaya before K.E. 456 (A.D. 705-6), the date of the plates

It may, however be, objected that Śīlāditya III is not known by the name Vajraṭa. This objection has not much force; for from the middle of the seventh century A.D. Śīlāditya became the conventional name of all kings of Valabhī. Śīlāditya III was followed by four other kings, all of whom were known by the same name Śīlāditya. As in the case of the Daddas and Jayabhaṭas of the Gurjara dynasty they must have had other personal names by which they were distinguished from one another. Some of the predecessors of Śīlāditya III had such a personal name in addition to that ending in *āditya*. See, *e.g.* the names of Dhruvasena II-Bālāditya and Kharagraha II-Dharmāditya. Some of these names, again ended in ṭa.[22] The inference seems therefore justifiable that Vajraṭa was another name of Śīlāditya III. His defeat by Dharāśraya-Jayasiṃha seems to have occurred some time between A.D. 678 and A.D. 685.

As for the emperor of North India defeated by Vinayāditya and his son Vijayāditya in their northern expedition, he may have been identical with Vajrāyudha if the latter was the king whose name began with *Va* and who is so highly glorified in the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. We, have, however, no means of ascertaining his power and influence except a casual statement in Rājaśekahara's *Karpūramañjarī* that he was ruling over Pañcāla with his capital at Kanauj.

V. V. Mirashi

21 This is the only grant of land in the Broach District made by Śīlāditya III. He did not make four such grants as incorrectly stated by Mr. Gadre. (*Important Inscriptions etc.* p. 18).

22 Names ending in *ṭa* were current in Kathaiawad as in Kashmir. See the names of Derabhaṭa, the grand-father of Śīlāditya III and Dhruvabhaṭa (Śīlāditya, VII). See also the names Sarvaṭa and Hembaṭa mentioned in the Aḷina plate of Śīlāditya VII.

Vajraṭa and the 'Va' of the Mañju-śrī-mūlakalpa

In a recent article on "Vajraṭa" Dr. N. Venkataramanayya[1] tries to identify the Vajraṭa of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records with a king—mentioned in the *Mañju-śrī-mūla-kalpa* whose name is said to have commenced with the letter 'Va'.[2] Dr. Venkataramanayya rightly contends that the name Vajraṭa is a proper name, and that it is not found among the rulers of any of the four South Indian dynasties viz. the Kāñciśa, the Keraḷa-narādhipa, the Coḷa and the Pāṇḍya, "placed in juxtaposition" to him.

He maintains that the Cāḷukyas came into conflict with the North Indian powers on three different occasions viz. (a) Maṅgaleśa with the Kalacuri king Buddharāja,[3] (b) Pulikeśin II, with Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj,[4] (c) and lastly, Vinayāditya, who assisted by his son Vijayāditya, conducted a campaign into North-India during the reign of Vikramāditya himself.[5] Dr. Venkataramanayya further says that Vajraṭa must have been as great and powerful a king as Śrī Harṣa inasmuch as his name was considered worthy to be placed with that of the latter, and that he may have flourished subsequent to the time of Harṣa—an inference suggested by the circumstance that in the records his name is mentioned after that of Harṣa. Hence he concludes that the conflict between the Cāḷukyas and Vajraṭa must have taken place after the death of Harṣa and therefore on the third and the last occasion when they had to deal with a North Indian power i.e. under Vikramāditya. Consequently, the defeat referred to in the Nerur plates is the defeat inflicted on Vajraṭa.

"(His dear son) Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world—who was possessed of the *Pāḷidhvaja* and all the other mighty insignia of supreme dominion which he had acquired by crushing the lord of all the region of the North"—"(Vijayāditya), (Who), his grandfather having been victorious in the region of the South, uprooted the thicket of thorn brushes which was the assemblage of his foes, (in that direction); who, following the avocation of war even in front of his father who was desirous of conquering the region of the North,—had the edge of his Sword worn away

1 Dr. Venkataramanayya, "Vajraṭa", *IHQ.*, XX, No. 2, pp. 181 ff. (1944).

2 Jayaswal, *An Imperial History of India,* pp. 63 (S.848), 66-67.

3 Fleet, "The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription of Maṅgaleśa", *IA.*, XIX, p. 19.

4 Kielhorn, "Aihoḷe Inscription of Pulikeśin II," *EI.*, VI, p. 8.

5 Fleet, "Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions (The Nerur Plates)", *IA.*, IX, pp. 126 ff.

by splitting open the foreheads of the elephants of his foes, who was in the foremost rank in all battles, who was flavoured with the quality of excellent impetuosity."[6]

The Nerur plates, however, for some unknown reason, do not disclose the name of the vanquished monarch, but rest content with calling him a *Sakal-ottarāpathanātha,* the paramount sovereign of Northern India. Dr. Venkataramanayya assigns 674 A.D. for his defeat,[7] as the North Indian expedition under Vinayāditya and Vijayāditya was conducted during Vikramāditya's conquest of the Southern region, which took place in the same year as recorded by the Gadval plates.[8]

Now with reference to the conjecture of Dr. Venkataramanayya that Vajraṭa is the same as the monarch 'Va' mentioned in the *Mañju-śrī-mūla-kalpa,* it must be observed that if he accepts, as he seems to do, the identification of 'Dha' his immediate predecessor, with Dharasena IV of the Maitraka dynasty, 'Va' does not correspond to the first syllable of the name of the successor of Dharasena, viz. Dhruvasena III. Nor is any ruler of this name, viz. Vajraṭa, known among the successors of Dharasena IV. But it is possible to argue that either Dhruvasena III or one of his successors may have borne another name which began with the syllable 'Va' just as Kharagraha is called Capala in the same Buddhist work.[9] Here however an objection may be raised against K. P. Jayaswal's interpretation of the passage in the *Mañju-śrī-mūla-kalpa*[10] in connection with the letters 'Dha' and 'Va' as referring to the rulers of the Maitraka line as successors of the Puṣpabhūtis. Firstly, why should the name of Rājya-vardhana be introduced so abruptly in discussing the later Gupta chronology, while the change of dynasty is not indicated in the passage? Then again, why should Rājyavardhana's name alone be given in full, while the rulers in the preceding as well as in the following verses are referred to with the

6 Fleet, "Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions." *IA.*, IX, pp. 127-28.

"सकलोत्तरापथनाथमथनोपार्ज्जितपालिध्वजादिसमस्तपारमैश्वर्य्यचिह्नस्य विनयादित्य सत्याश्रय श्रीपृथिवीवल्लभ-महाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वर-भट्टारकः ।"

"दक्षिणाशाविजयिनि पितामहे समुन्मुलित-निखिल-कराटकसंहतिरुत्तरापथ-विजिगीषोर्ग्गुरोर्ग्र त एवाहव-व्यापारमचरन्नरातिगजघटापाटन-विशिर्य्यमाणकृपाणधारः समग्रविग्रहग्रेसरः सत्साहसरसिकः ।"

7 Hultzsch, "Gadval Plates of Vikramāditya I, (A.D. 674)", *EI.*, X, pp. 102 ff. Venkataramanayya, *Art. cit.*

9 Jayaswal, *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 66.

Kālibhanā Grants

While correcting the proofs of our paper entitled "Kālibhanā Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Somavaṃśī King Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya", published in *IHQ.*, XX, pp. 237-50, Mr. P. C. Rath added three footnotes dealing with the palaeography of the records, the location of Trikaliṅga and the indentification of Mahā-Bhavagupta who issued the Kesarkella charter. Mr. Rath could not agree with me on the above points and expressed his own views. Unfortunately the notes reached me too late to be incorporated into the paper. In justice however, to Mr. Rath, I think it necessary to publish the main points in his notes, even though I may not agree with any of the conclusions, I refrain from offering any comments of my own.

Mr. Rath first draws our attention to the resemblance between the script of the Kesarkella grant and that used in the Nivinna grant of Śailodbhava Dharmarāja. This script is further noticed by him in the records of the Gaṅga kings Indravarman of the 10th century, Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga and Bhānudeva II of the 13th century. He concludes that this script was in use in the present day Oriya tract from the 6th to the 13th century. He does not find any palæographical difficulty in assigning the Kālibhanā charters to the 6th or the 7th century A.D. In a subsequent note he calls the script proto-Oriya.

As regards Trikaliṅga, Mr. Rath says that in the Somavaṃśī grants villages donated in Kosala are clearly indicated to have belonged to that country and that in none of the records Kosala is said to form a part of Trikaliṅga or the latter a part of the former. The theory that the eastern districts of Kosala were included in Trikaliṅga is therefore wrong according to Mr. Rath. He suggests that at the time of Mahā-Bhavagupta Trikaliṅga meant Kaliṅga, Koṅgoḍa and Oḍra. In a subsequent note he adds that it indicated Kaliṅga, Koṅgoḍa and Tosala at the time of Gaṅga Indravarman, but Kaliṅga, Koṅgoḍa and Utkala in the days of Yayāti II.

Mr. Rath believes in the existence of the so-called Mahā-Bhavagupta supposed to be the father of Śivagupta and grand-father of Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya and is inclined to identify him with Mahā-Bhavagupta of the Kesarkella inscription. He draws attention to the figure on the seal which in his opinion resembles Early Gaṅga seals, to the use of a legend as in the seals of the Pāṇḍuvaṃśīs and to the non-mention of the king's father's name. But he does claim that the proposed identification is quite beyond doubt.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

The Laghu-Ṣaṣṭha variety of an Anuṣṭubh meter

In the note entitled "*The sixth and seventh syllables of an Anuṣṭubh quarter*" (*IHQ.*, XX, pp. 82-3) Mr. D. C. Sircar has attempted to reply to my criticism (*IHQ.*, XIX, pp. 358-9) of his finding fault with the meter in the lenged-verse on the seal of the Pīperḍūla Copperplate Inscription (*ibid.*, XIX. pp. 142 f.). As will be clear from a perusal of my two papers on the varieties of the Anuṣṭubh meter [*Nagpur University Journal,* (*NUJ*). No. 2 (1936) and 6 (1940)], the historical Anūṣṭubh meter (called *Vaktra, padya* or *Śloka*), as employed in the classical period by the standard writers, has got 20 permissible varieties, where the rules of Laghu-pañcama and Guru-ṣaṣṭha are not observed. These varieties are as prevalent and recognised as the standardised norm of the Anuṣṭubh meter. The quarter-verse in question, Khaḍgadhārā-jita-bhuvaḥ is therefore just one of the 20 varieties and *not* a 'poetic licence.' A good number of examples of such occurrences are found in the works of standard Kāvya-writers. Are we to take such 55 cases in the *Raghuvaṃśa,* 39 cases in the *Kumārasambhava,* 23 cases in the *Kirātārjunīya* and 124 cases in the *Śiśupālavadha* (See *NUJ.*, No. 2, 1936, p. 67) as cases of poetic licence? These cases should be taken as permissible varieties and *not* as "violations" by versifiers. The works on Prosody have recognised these varieties and have named them as *Vipulā* and *Capalā* varieties of the meter (See *Piṅgala,* v-16/9; *Vṛttaratnākara,* II-iv) Thus there is no truth in the statement of Mr. Sircar that "As a matter of fact there is not a single authority on Sanskrit meter that allows a laghuṣaṣṭha in any quarter—odd or even— of the Anuṣṭubh meter."

In support of his proposed emendment (?), Mr. Sircar has quoted three verses to show that when the fifth and sixth syllables are respectively short and long, the seventh syllable can be short *even* in odd quarters. But these verses do not illustrate the historical Anuṣṭubh or its exceptional permissible varieties. The historical Anuṣṭubh is *vaktra-anuṣṭubh* (an *ardha-sama* or *Viṣama vṛtta*) and it should be distinguished from the *varṇika-anuṣṭubh,* which is a *sama vṛtta.* The first and third verses quoted by Mr. Sircar are just the reverse (viparīta) of *Pathyā-vaktra* (Anuṣṭubh)—See *Vṛttaratnākara* II-iv-3—which is a theoretical abstraction and has never been used by such Kāvya writers as Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Māgha etc. It would indeed be a great pity if Mr. Sircar were allowed to find fault with recog-

nised and permissible variety—[Vipulā variety of *Viṣama Vṛtta* (*Vaktra-anuṣṭubh*) according to metrical authorities or *R-ga-na-ga* variety of the historical anuṣṭubh according to the nomenclature given by me in *NUJ.*, No. 6, 1940]—and to substitute it by his proposed reading, relying on the solitary opinion of *Saitava*, not followed by standard Kāvya writers. Mr. Sircar's second verse is still more off the point. This verse is an example of *Pramāṇikā* or *Nagasvarūpiṇī* variety of *Samavṛtta Varṇika-anuṣṭubh*. To quote this verse to show "hollowness of my criticism" is to make confusion worse confounded.

S. P. CHATURVEDI

Subandhu's Vāsavadattānṛttadhāra

In *IHQ.*, XIX (1943), pp. 69-71, in my note on Subandhu I gave three references to and citations from the *Abhinavabhāratī* of Abhinavagupta, one from the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, and another from the *Avantisundarī* of Daṇḍin; I referred to the evidence of the *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa* too, and in a subsequent note on Subandhu of the Mauryan times in *IHQ.*, XX (1944) p. 85, I added a further reference from the *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Hariṣeṇa.

It is well known that the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* uses the *Abhinavabhāratī* extensively; hence we find that the illustration for Bandha or Capture from the Vāsavadattānṛttavāra found in the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* is given by Abhinavagupta himself: "ग्रहणं वा कार्यम्, सनिबन्धनबन्धनमिति । यथा वासवदत्तानृत्तधारे वत्सराजस्य ।" (*GOS.* edn. pt. 2, p. 427; Adyar Ms. vol. III, pp. 439-440).

There is yet another reference to and citation from this dramatic composition in the *Abhinavabhāratī* itself. In his comments on *Nāṭyaśātra*, 18.35, describing a Praveśaka, its nature and the ideas which could be put through it, Abhinavagupta cites the Nṛttavāra as having a praveśaka answering to the idea of Samrambha mentioned by Bharata. "संरम्भः कार्यविशेषेऽभिप्रायः, तस्यार्थः उपायान्वेषणादि, तदभिधानयुक्तः प्रवेशको 'यथा नृत्तवारे 'गति…,… उपस्थितमिदं तत्प्रयोजनम्' इत्यादि । अनेन वासवदत्तामपहृत्य उज्जयिनीं निनीषोः वत्सेशस्य प्रयोजकत्वं प्राप्तानाममात्यानाम् संरम्भः शालङ्कायनेनोक्तः ।" *Abhinavabhāratī*, Adyar Mss. vol. III, pp. 432-3; *GOS.* edn. pt. 2. p. 425.

V. RAGHAVAN

Vasundharā, the daughter of Vikrama

Mr. Sadashiv L. Katre of the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain has recently brought to light the two missing sections of Lakṣmidhara's *Kṛtya-kalpataru*. While giving a notice of this discovery in the pages of the *New Indian Antiquary* (vol. vi, p. 236) he has copied the opening passage of the MS. which contains the following verse, (No. 7) to which my attention was kindly drawn by Dr. H. R. Divekar, Director of the Institute.

व्रतेन मुक्तिमापन्ना हरिणाक्षी वसुन्धरा ।
विक्रमस्य सुत्य साध्वी दशार्णविनिवासिनी ॥

After dealing with the importance of the *vratas* and while enumerating the names of mythical persons who were benefited by the observance of the Vratas the author makes mention in this verse of a lady who had attained salvation by religious observance. The pious lady was the daughter of Vikrama, she was named Vasundharā and was a resident of Daśārṇa.

Vikrama mentioned here can be no other than the great Gupta king Candragupta II Vikramāditya and his daughter Vasundharā must be identified with the famous Vākāṭaka queen Prabhāvatī. She is said here to have belonged to the province of Daśārṇa, which is be identified with the Dosarena of the Periplus and with the modern Chattishgarh district of the C.P.[1] Vijaya Dasanapura in the Andhra country mentioned in some inscriptions as the capital of a Vākāṭaka principality seems to have been named after this province.[2] It is thus clear that Daṣārṇa denoted the country over which the Vākāṭakas were ruling and the lady referred to in the passage must be identified with the Vākāṭaka queen. In the present passage she bears the name of Vasundharā, which seems to be her other name adopted after she had married in the Vākāṭaka family, but it did not become so common as the name Prabhāvatī given to her by her Gupta parents and which continued to be regularly used even in the Vākāṭaka inscriptions. As the Guptas and the Vākāṭakas often liked to take two names it is not unlikely that the Vākāṭaka queen also bore two names.

1 Nandalal Dey, *Geographical Dictionary*, p. 54.
2 K. P. Jayaswal, *History of India*, p. 136.

Though much is not known of the pious deeds of Vasundharā or Prabhāvatī her name seems to have become well known throughout India in the ancient days like that of Ahalyabai Holkar in the modern times. There is a number of common points in the lives of these two pious ladies from royal families. Some copper-plate grants made by Prabhāvatī for religious purposes are found.[3] She was an extreme devotee of Viṣṇu and liked to reside at the sacred place Rāmagiri modern Ramtek in the C.P. Prabhāvatī or Vasundharā, the worthy daughter of Candragupta II, who was well versed in the Vedas and the Smṛtis, devoted her long life 'of more than a hundred years' in religious observances and utilised her royal resources for them and left her memory behind as a great pious lady. The author of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, who lived in the same province in which Vasundharā had ruled and lived, naturally quoted her name with veneration while giving a list of those who are said to have obtained bliss by the observances of the *vratas*.

One point which requires to be specially noted in this connection is that of the several rulers with whose name the epithet Vikrama or Vikramāditya has been attached in Indian history, the Gupta ruler Candragupta II, referred to in the present passage, seems to have been most commonly denoted by the epithet.

D. B. DISKALKAR

3 Bhandarkar, *List of Northern Inscriptions*, Nos. 1703, 1704, 1706.

THE LAST PESHWA AND THE ENGLISH COMMISSIONERS, 1818-1851. By Dr. P. C. Gupta, M.A., PH.D. Calcutta, 1944.

Dr. P. C. Gupta's *Bajị Rao II and the East India Company*, published more than five years ago, deals with the story of the last Peshwa till 1818 when he lost his Peshwaship and surrendered to the English. In the monograph under review the story is brought down to 1851, when he died. It is really a continuation of the previous work, although it is complete in itself and possesses an independent interest of its own. The book is primarily based on unpublished British official documents. The author regrets that "one does not get enough Marathi materials for writing an intimate account of the Peshwa's life in exile." But he has succeeded in giving us a well-written story full of human interest. Incidentally we find here some useful details about some forgotten servants of the Company, who acted as Commissioners at Bithur. We believe this little volume will be well-received by all students of Maratha History.

A. C. BANERJEE

AURANGZEB (in Bengali). Translated from Urdu by Prof. Muhammad Mansuruddin. Calcutta, 1943.

This small monograph of 110 pages is the Bengali version of Maulana Shibli Nomani's well-known booklet on Aurangzeb. The translator has added nothing to the original work. Maulana Nomani's book is an attempt to refute the charges brought against Aurangzeb by Western and Indian scholars; the subject is treated from a new angle of vision, but very few modern scholars will be inclined to accept the arguments at their face value. The translator should have made use of the materials which have accumulated since the publication of Maulana Nomani's book.

A. C. BANERJEE

BṚHAT KATHĀKOŚA OF ĀCĀRYA HARIṢEṆA. The Sanskrit text authentically edited for the first time with various readings, with a critical introduction, notes, index of proper names etc. by Dr. A. N. Upadhye, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of Ardha-māgadhī, Rajaram College, Kolhapur. Singhi Jain Series, Number 17. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. Quart 128+402.

This is a beautiful edition of a tenth century Sanskrit work of the Jains. It contains 157 tales illustrating different aspects of Jain *ārādhanā*.

The edition is based on three very late manuscripts of the 18th and the 19th centuries, presumably emanating from the same locality, e.g., Jaipur. There is no indication if other and older manuscripts are available or known. The manuscripts consulted generally agree with one another, except in minor details: the points of difference have been recorded in the foot-notes. The text as preserved in the manuscripts is apparently corrupt in many places. But it has not been disturbed with emendations: these have been occasionally suggested either in the foot-notes or in the Notes appended to the volume.

Though edification of Jainism is the main aim of the tales, many of them possess enough secular interest. And the fact that a good number of them are found to occur, with or without variations, in different works belonging to Brahmanic Hindus, Jains as well as Buddhists adds to their value and importance from the standpoint of the history of folk-lore in India.

In a long introduction the learned editor besides drawing attention to the critical apparatus and the method followed in the presentation of the text, gives a comprehensive account of the narrative tale in old Indian literature with special reference to the literature of the Jains which can boast of a rich store of this material. A detailed study on the author and characteristic features of the work and its language forms the concluding part of the introduction. An investigation into the linguistic peculiarities reveal usages not permitted by rules of classical Sanskrit. Some of these agree with similar forms in epic Sanskrit while others are believed to bear traces of Prakritic influenie or 'loose handling of grammatical standard.' But it is not safe to arrive at a definite conclusion with regard to the distinctive features of what is called Jain Sanskrit at the present stage of our knowledge of this literature. So the learned editor has rightly sounded a note of warning towards the end of the introduction; 'the future studies of similar works alone would decide whether the [irregular forms] represent any grammatical tradition or they are author's irregularities and scribal slips in some cases' (p. 110). A thorough analysis of works of this type through scientific and critical editions is therefore expected to be of very great importance from the standpoint of linguistics as well as folklore. So the world of scholars will be grateful to Prof. Upadhye and the management of the Singhi Jain series for undertaking a scholarly edition of one of these works.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Annals of Oriental Research (University of Madras), vol. VII, pt. 1

V. RĀGHAVAN.—*The Snuṣāvijaya of Sundararājakavi.* The *Snuṣāvijaya,* a short, one-act Sanskrit play of the Prahasana type composed in the last century has been edited here. The poet Sundararāja depicting the age-old conflict between the mother-in-law and the daughter-in-law has shown a consummate power of observation and a good sense of humour.

T. R. CHINTAMANI.—*Kauṣītaka and Śāṅkhāyana Upaniṣads.* The readings displayed in a tabular form show that the Upaniṣad portion of the *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka* and *the Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇopaniṣad* belong to two separate branches of the *Ṛgveda.*

Brahmavidyā, vol. VIII, pt. 3 (October, 1944)

A. N. KRISHNA AIYANGAR.—*Gajendramokṣa. An Identification.* Gajendramokṣa is mentioned in the itenerary of King Kṛṣṇadeva-rāya of Vijayanagara. The name is reminiscent of the Bhāgavata story of the deliverance of Gajendra. The place has been identified with Attāzhanallūr situated between Pāpanāśam and Tinnevelly in the Madras Presidency.

Jain Antiquary, vol. X, no. 1 (June, 1944)

A. CHAKRAVARTI.—*The Contribution of Jainism to World Culture.*

B. C. LAW.—*Vaiśāli, Mahāvīra's Birth Place.*

KAMTA PRASAD JAIN.—*The Jaina Chronology.* Events of the ancient historical period are shown in tables with dates. This instalment of the paper is concerned with the period between 307 B.C. and 53 B.C.

Journal of the Bihar Research Society, vol. XXX, pt. 11 (June, 1944)

RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI.—*The University of Nalandā.*

JAGADISH NARAYAN SARKAR.—*A few Letters of Qutub Shah and Mir Jumla relating to Karnatak Affairs.*

B. GHOSH.—*Indian Embassy to Khusrū II of Persia.*

ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE.—*Sikhism and the Medieval Reformation.*

Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, vol. I, pt. 4 (August, 1944)

V. V. MIRASHI.—*A Note of the Māṅkaṇi Grant of Taralasvāmin.* The writer supposes that the Māṅkaṇi grant was forged in the second half of the eighth century. The decimal notation used in the grant for recording the date does not therefore prove that the notation was in vogue for Indian inscription from an earlier time.

TARA SANKAR BHATTACHARYA.—*Negation according to Navya-Nyāya.*

S. C. SARKAR.—*Kālidāsa and his Contemporaries in a Tibetan Reference.* A Tibetan passage taken from a cyclopædia callled *Dpag. bsam. ljon. basaṅ* mentions Kālidāsa as a contemporary of Kings Bhāgabhadra Śuṅga of Vidiśā, Vīma Kusula Kadaphisa of Vārāṇasī and Svāti Sātavāhana of Dākṣiṇātya and Aparānta. Vararuci the Junior, Śaṅku, Bhāvarmā and Saptavarmā are also referred to as belonging to Kālidāsa's time. 'These statements and consequent probabilities' suggest that the 'first' Kālidāsa may have lived in the middle of the 1st century B.C.

M. V. KIBE.—*Who was the Founder of the Vikrama Era.* Arguments are put forward to prove that the invasion of India by Alexander took place at the time of Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty, and that Skandagupta of the same dynasty established the Vikrama era in the 1st century B.C.

B. C. LAW.—*Ayodhyā in Ancient India.*

K. R. PISHAROTI.—*Udayottuṅga.* The correct name of the author of the *Kaumudī* on the *Locana of* Abhinavagupta is Udayottuṅga and not Uttuṅgodaya. He flourished in the 15th century, and besides the love-lyric called *Mayūrasandeśa,* the *Līlātilaka,* a work on the rhetoric of the Malayalam language is presumably his composition.

Journal of Indian History, vol. XXIII, pt. 2 (August, 1944)

K. S. THAPAR.—*Maharaja Dalip Singh after Deposition.* The paper discusses the circumstances leading to Dalip Singh's conversion to Christianity, marriage with a foreign girl, and exile to the continent of Europe.

T. K. JOSEPH.—*Criterior India of Rufinus, Circa 400 A.D.* The writer's conclusion is that Criterior India mentioned in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Rufinus cannot but be South Arabia.

ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE.—*Origin of Shik Militarism.*

R. KRISHNAMURTHI.—*Jains at the Court of Akbar.*

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Letters, vol. X, 1944, no. 1

D. H. GORDON.—*Hellenism in North-West India.* The extent of the Hellenistic influence on Gandhāra art has been discussed.

HARIT KRISHNA DEB.—*Mathura Lion-Capital Inscriptions.* The readings of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions on the 'Lion' capital from Mathuta have been revised.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI.—*A Note on a Unique Work on Vedānta.* The manuscript described belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. It is called *Saugatasūtravyākhyānakārikā* and is attributed to Kumārila Svāmin. Consisting of 222 verses divided into three sections, the treatise deals with the nature of self.

B. PRASHAD.—*Rājā Bīrbal—a biographical study, and an account of his articles of worship.*

CHARU CHANDRA DAS GUPTA.—*Supplement to Bibliography of Ancient Indian Terracotta Figurines.*

S. N. CHAKRAVARTI.—*An Outline of Stone Age in India.*

Journal of Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute, vol. V, no. 2 (July-December, 1944)

N. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI.—*Śaiva Siddhānta.* Twelve verses of the *Raurava Āgama* with Śivāgrayogin's Bhāṣya on them have been explained here as the basis of the Śaiva Siddhānta system, which recognises three categories *Paśu, Pāśa* and *Pati* correspoding to *Cit, Acit* and *Īśvara* of the Vedānta. The Śaivas accept *jñāna* and *bhakti* as the chief means of salvation, according a higher place to *bhakti* and the consequent grace of God. To a Śaiva, God is *nirguṇa* in the sense that He transcends the three *guṇas—sattva, rajas,* and *tamas.* In its four-fold teachings under *caryā, kriyā, yoga* and *jñāna,* the Śaiva Siddhānta is more or less in accordance with the spirit of Vedānta.

P. K. GODE.—*A Rare Manuscript of Janārdana-mahodaya by Raghunātha Gaṇeśa Navahasta, Friend of Saint Rāmadāsa—Between A.D. 1640 and 1682.* The ms. analysed 'is a sort of manual of Vaiṣṇavite ritual and worship.'

University of Ceylon Review, vol. II, nos. 1-2. (October, 1944)

O. H. DE A. WIJISEKARA.—*Upaniṣadic Terms for Sense-Functions.* The writer of the paper discusses the meaning of the terms *devāḥ, deva-*